

8-1-2016

A Multiple Case Study Analysis of Mentor-Mentee Perception of the Effectiveness of Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

Khaled Ismail Alnajjar
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Alnajjar, Khaled Ismail, "A Multiple Case Study Analysis of Mentor-Mentee Perception of the Effectiveness of Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience" (2016). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 2771.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/9302924>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY ANALYSIS OF MENTOR-MENTEE PERCEPTION OF THE
EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF-DISCLOSURE IN THE FIELD EXPERIENCE

By

Khaled Ismail Alnajjar

Bachelor of Arts -- English Language and Literature
Al-Mustansiriya University
2000

Master of Arts -- Education/Curriculum and Instruction
University of Phoenix
2009

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctor of Philosophy--Curriculum & Instruction

Department of Teaching & Learning
College of Education
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
August 2016

Copyright by Khaled Alnajjar, 2016

All Rights Reserved



Dissertation Approval

The Graduate College
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

June 22, 2016

This dissertation prepared by

Khaled Ismail Alnajjar

entitled

A Multiple Case Study Analysis of Mentor-Mentee Perception of the Effectiveness of
Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy-Curriculum & Instruction
Department of Teaching & Learning

Shaoan Zhang, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Chair

Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D.
Graduate College Interim Dean

Katrina Liu, Ph.D.
Examination Committee Member

Jane McCarthy, Ed.D.
Examination Committee Member

Vicki J. Rosser, Ph.D.
Graduate College Faculty Representative

ABSTRACT

A Multiple Case Study Analysis of Mentor-Mentee Perception of the Effectiveness of Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

By

Khaled Ismail Alnajjar

Dr. Shaoan Zhang, Committee Chair

Dr. Jane McCarthy, Committee Member

Dr. Katrina Liu, Committee Member

Dr. Vicki J. Rosser, Graduate College Representative

During the field experience, the mentors and preservice teachers share personal and professional experiences on a daily basis. This process of information sharing is seen critical to the mentoring relationship development and preservice teachers' learning to teach. This qualitative study investigates the mentor-mentee perception of the effectiveness of self-disclosure in the field experience. Data was collected from two mentor teachers and three preservice teachers through three different phases and via triangulated sources: semi-structured interviews, direct observation, and focus group interview. Moreover, the findings were reported based on the three themes that are related to research questions: topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure, factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure, and impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship development. This study developed a theoretical understanding of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience. Additionally, this study shed light on the further investigation of research and theoretical framework of self-disclosure in the field of teacher education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to express my endless gratitude to all faculty members in Teaching and Learning and other departments who contributed and supported me during the doctoral program. A special feeling of gratitude is due to my Doctoral Advisory Committee Chair, Dr. Shaoan Zhang, who has never ceased to support and push me to complete this work through all tough times. Additionally, I wish to extend my gratitude and appreciation to my Doctoral Advisory Committee Members who provided me with feedback and advice, Dr. Jane McCarthy, Dr. Vicki Rosser, and Dr. Katrina Liu. Furthermore, I would like to thank Dr. Steve McCafferty who was also a source of positive ideas, advice and feedback. Finally, I would like to express my acknowledgment to the research participants in my dissertation for giving me the time and opportunity to conduct this work, and for being interested in my work.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family whose love and support has been unconditional throughout my journey. Dad, your prophetic words of wisdom and encouragement have never ceased to resonate in my mind. Mom, I know how eager you were to see me in the graduation gown, but since you left, life has been insipid and happiness abandoned me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	1
Overview of Mentor-Mentee Self-disclosure in the Field Experience	3
Self-Disclosure.....	6
Mentee (Preservice Teacher) and Learning to Teach in the Field Experience.....	7
Mentor and Mentoring in the Field Experience	9
Interrelationship of Mentoring and Learning to Teach.....	11
Research Questions	13
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	14
Social Penetration Theory	15
Social Exchange Theory	19
Summary	24
CHAPTER TWO	25
REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON SELF-DISCLOSURE	25
Conceptual Framework.....	25
Selection of Literature	26
Preservice Teachers' Learning in the Field Experience.....	27
Mentee's and Mentor's Self-Disclosure.....	29
Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development.....	35
Self-Disclosure and Learning to Teach.....	39
Summary	42
CHAPTER THREE.....	45
RESEARCH METHODS	45
Research Design	45
Research Questions	47
The Study Site	47

Participants.....	48
Researcher Role.....	52
Data Sources	53
Observation Protocol	53
Semi-structured Interview Protocol	54
Focus Group Interview Protocol.....	55
Data Collection.....	56
Phase 1: Beginning of School Semester.....	56
Phase II: Middle of the School Semester	58
Phase III: End of the School Semester.....	59
Data Analysis	61
Human Subject	62
Privacy and Confidentiality	63
Connection to Theory and Methodology	63
Summary	64
CHAPTER FOUR	65
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	65
Case Study 1 Carlos, Alice and Mr. Phillip	67
Topics and Purposes of Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience	67
Factors that Influence Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience	77
Self-Disclosure and Learning to Teach.....	84
Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development	90
Summary of Case 1	94
Case 2 Gallardo and Ms. Kate.....	95
Topics and Purposes of Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience	95
Factors that Influence Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience	103
Self-Disclosure and Learning to Teach.....	108
Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development	113
Summary of Case 2	115
Cross-Case Analysis	116
Topics and Purposes of Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience	117
Factors that Influence the Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience	119

Self-Disclosure and Learning to Teach.....	121
Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development.....	122
Summary	123
CHAPTER FIVE.....	125
DISCUSSION	125
Summary of the Main Findings.....	126
Research Question One	126
Research Question Two	127
Research Question Three	128
Interpretation of the Findings.....	129
Interrelated Topics and Purposes of Self-Disclosure.....	130
Factors that Influence Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure.....	133
Self-Disclosure and Learning.....	137
Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development.....	141
Contribution to Theory	143
Social Penetration Theory	143
Social Exchange Theory	146
Understanding the Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience.....	148
Implications for Theories, Practices and Future Research.....	150
Implications for Theories	150
Implications for Practice in Teacher Education.....	151
Limitations	153
Recommendations for Future Research.....	154
Summary	155
Conclusion	155
APPENDIX (A ¹): MENTORS' FIRST INTERVIEW	158
APPENDIX (A ²): MENTORS' SECOND INTERVIEW	160
APPENDIX (A ³): MENTORS' THIRD INTERVIEW.....	162
APPENDIX (B ¹): PRESERVICE TEACHERS' FIRST INTERVIEW	164
APPENDIX (B ²): PRESERVICE TEACHERS' SECOND INTERVIEW	166
APPENDIX (B ³): PRESERVICE TEACHERS' THIRD INTERVIEW.....	168
APPENDIX (C): OBSERVATION CHECKLIST.....	170

APPENDIX (D): FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW	172
APPENDIX (E): APPROVAL TO USE A TABLE	174
APPENDIX (F) IRB APPROVAL FORM.....	176
REFERENCES.....	177
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	194

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Benefits of Mentoring for Preservice teachers, Mentors and Schools.	13
Table 2. The Study Participants	53
Table 3. Connecting data sources with research questions.	56
Table 4. Sub-Themes of Topics of Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience	68
Table 5.Sub-Themes of Factors that Influence Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in Case 1.....	78
Table 6. Sub-Themes of Topics of Mentor-Mentor Self-Disclosure in Case 2.....	96
Table 7. Summary of the Sub-Themes from the Two Case Studies	117

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Chapter One provides an overview and theoretical framework of this dissertation. The first section of this chapter starts with an overview of the importance of communication between the mentors and mentees in a variety of disciplines in general, and in the field experience in specific. A special emphasis is given to the mentor-mentee self-disclosure and how it has been viewed and used in different mentoring contexts. Also, this section provides an overview of some overarching topics of mentoring, and the purpose of the dissertation along with the research questions. The second section of Chapter One presents the theoretical framework upon which this study is built. It starts with a rationale behind using social theories to conduct this study, and then it provides a discussion of the social penetration theory and social exchange theory. Because this chapter is an overview, it only provides a brief presentation of all the elements, which are defined and discussed in more depth in the chapters that follow.

Chapter Two provides a review of the most relevant and important literature on the mentor-mentee self-disclosure. The first section of Chapter Two begins by providing the framework upon which the topics of the literature were selected, and a rationale for the selection of literature. The second section, which makes the bulk of this chapter, outlines a review of the most relevant and important studies that examined the mentor-mentee self-disclosure. A special emphasis is given to the studies that are related to self-disclosure between the mentor teachers and preservice teachers in the field experiences. The studies in this section focus on preservice teachers' learning in the field experience, mentee's and mentor's self-disclosure, self-disclosure and mentoring relationship development, and self-disclosure and learning to teach. A summary

of each category or set of studies is provided to show the common and uncommon denominators between the studies. The final section, however, provides a summary that concludes this chapter.

Chapter Three presents an overview of the selected methodology for this dissertation. The chapter starts by providing a rationale of the study, a rationale of the selected methods and design, the purpose of the study followed by research questions, human subject, and participants and site. The second section presents the data sources (semi-structured interviews, direct observation, and focus group interview), data collection, and data analysis. The final section discusses the privacy and confidentiality of the participants, potential limitations of the research design, connection to theory and methodology, and a summary that concludes the chapter.

Chapter Four presents the findings of the current study. The findings in this chapter are reported in two ways, including a description of participants, themes and sub-themes emerged from the data analysis of each case study separately, and a comparison of the findings from all cases collectively. This chapter is dedicated to answering the research questions by describing the major findings in three aspects: first, topics and purposes of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience are explained; second, factors that influence the social exchange of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience; and third, impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience.

Chapter Five discusses the findings of the current study. The chapter begins by providing a general overview of the previous chapters focusing on Chapter Three (methodology). Next, a summary of the major findings is provided. The discussion section then follows explaining the findings in relation to the theories and literature mentioned in the previous chapters. Furthermore, this chapter offers implications, limitations of the current study, and

recommendations for future studies. Finally, Chapter Five draws a final conclusion for this dissertation.

Overview of Mentor-Mentee Self-disclosure in the Field Experience

The importance of the field experience in teacher learning has become undeniable (Darling-Hammond, 2006). During the field experience, the preservice teachers learn to teach by observing their assigned mentor teachers as well as by teaching and reflection. The mentors' job includes three active roles: emotional support systems, socializing agents, and instructional coaches (Butler & Cuenca, 2012). Hill et al. (1989) described mentoring as "a communication relationship in which a senior person supports, tutors, guides, and facilitates a junior person's career development" (p. 15). Moreover, when the mentor and mentee communicate properly, a mentoring relationship is established. The mentor in such a relationship shares information and experiences, and monitors the preservice teacher's performance of some required skills (Monsour & Corman, 1991). Despite the fact that research and practice have offered guidelines for effective teacher education, a small body of research has investigated whether the communication between preservice teachers and their mentors impedes or facilitates teacher learning and mentoring (Zhang et al., 2015). Therefore, communication is an ignored portion of teacher education practice and research (Lawley, Moore & Smajiic, 2014).

The mentor-mentee relationship development plays a dynamic role in new teachers' learning to teach (Cherian, 2007), and this relationship is seen as central to teacher learning in the field of teacher education. Practitioners and researchers have identified some tasks and activities by which preservice teachers and their mentors can engage in formal communication, and thus help preservice teachers learn how to teach. For instance, the Santa Cruz New Teacher Center (Center, 2002) provides the mentors and preservice teachers with valuable activities such

as the Collaborative Assessment Log, and the Analysis of Students' Work (Zhang et al., 2015).

Formal communication can help preservice teachers learn the professional aspect of teaching such as assessing students' learning, planning lessons and teaching planned lessons.

Although formal communication can help preservice teachers learn the professional aspect of teaching, it may not necessarily build trust and respect between them and their mentors, which Hudson (2013) describes as the foundations of the relationship development in mentoring contexts. Ragins and Cotton (1999) state that formal communication in mentoring programs does not establish trusting relationships. Eby and Lockwood (2004) argue that the essence of trusting relationships between the mentors and preservice teachers is informal communication and mutual attraction.

Creating both formal and informal communication channels is central for both the preservice teachers and mentors to trust, share and learn from each other (Walkington, 2005). While both parties engage in formal activities and communication, they also engage in informal communication during lunch breaks or some other personal times and occasions (Zhang et al., 2015). O'Brien and Goddard (2006) noted that the levels of communication and interactions between the mentor and mentee result from the levels of the mentor's supportiveness. This type of supportive relationship explains the mentor's actions such as sharing of resources and information, risk-taking, and listening attentively. This sharing, in fact, may show the mentee the active pedagogical practices, and further add to the mentoring outcomes (Hellsten et al., 2009).

Furthermore, the mentor's support may establish a trusting relationship (Street, 2004). Street (2004) states that new teachers learn to teach "in a highly social and dynamic space" (p.7), and recommends investigating the sharing of cultural and social learning experiences between mentors and novice teachers. Butler and Cuenca (2012) also argue that the mentor-mentee

relationships are contextualized by individual, social, and cultural factors. Consequently, mentors alone cannot establish practical, cultural, and social contexts; nevertheless, the communication between the preservice teachers and their mentors may create such contexts where both parties share experiences, and support each other (Zhang et al., 2015). Nonetheless, little research has examined the informal communication between the mentors and preservice teachers during the field experience and its effects on both the mentoring relationship development and preservice teachers' learning to teach.

Reflecting on my seven-year teaching experience in the elementary and high schools in Jordan, Saudi Arabia and the U.S., choosing whether to disclose or not, or when and what to disclose to students was nothing but an accumulative experience. Since my Bachelor degree was in English Literature, I entered the teaching profession without any professional background or training. So, I have always pondered how easier the beginning of my teaching career would be, if there were mentors who shared their personal and professional experiences, and provided me with guidance, advice and feedback. Also, the lack of concerns, experience and knowledge sharing which resulted from the absence of mentoring programs, led to the feeling of guilt and shame whenever I was confronted with career-related conflicts. Additionally, the lack of sharing of personal and professional experiences created two isolated groups of teachers: one group that included experienced teachers and another that included teachers with less or no experience. In this sense, my curiosity to explore the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the development of mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience comes mainly from my past experience.

The purpose of this study is to examine the mentor-mentee self-disclosure as an approach of informal communication and its effects on the mentoring relationship development and

preservice teachers' learning to teach during the field experience. Since studying the processes of the mentoring relationship from both mentors' and preservice teachers' sides has become the focus of mentoring literature (Dougherty & Dreher, 2007; Fletcher & Ragins, 2007; Wanberg, Welsh, & Hezlett, 2003), this study will add to the mentoring literature in three different ways. First, this study will add to the research of self-disclosure in mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach. Second, it will develop a theoretical understanding of the informal communication in the field experience. Third, this study will shed light on the further investigation of research and theoretical framework of self-disclosure in the field of teacher education.

Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure has been studied in different fields; thus, its definition has been modified to fit within these fields. For example, in Psychology, Jourard (1971) described it as a "trust or love act" and noted that self-disclosure occurs when a person thinks that another person deserves trust or love. Cozby (1973) described self-disclosure as "any information about himself which a Person A communicates verbally to a Person B" (p. 73), and "they would be unlikely to know otherwise" (Spence, Fox, Golding, & Daiches, 2012, p. 179). Cozby considered self-disclosure a nonstop process of information sharing that involves degrees of "breadth and depth." Therefore, self-disclosure affects both the person who discloses the information and the person who receives it. Later, Wheelless and Grotz (1976) defined self-disclosure as "any message about the self that a person communicates to another" (p. 47). Furthermore, self-disclosure has been defined as a communicative behavior through which the speaker makes him/ herself deliberately known to the other person (Pearce & Sharp, 1973), sometimes telling personal information which is private or sensitive that the speaker would not reveal to everyone who might ask for it

(Culbert, 1970). In the classroom, teachers' self-disclosure involves three dimensions: relevance, amount and valence (Cayanus & Martin, 2009). Relevance indicates that the disclosure is appropriate to the course content, amount refers to how frequently a teacher self-discloses during class, and valence includes both negative and positive disclosures.

In this research, building on Culbert's (1970) and Pearce's and Sharp's (1973) definitions of self-disclosure, I define the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience as any communicative behavior that allows the mentor and preservice teacher to deliberately make themselves known to each other by sharing personal or professional experiences that they would not reveal to anyone outside the mentoring relationship. This process of sharing is influenced by the contents of disclosures, individual differences, individual motives, and cultural and contextual factors (Harris, Dersch & Mittal, 1999).

To realize the role that self-disclosure plays in the development of mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach, one must first understand the definitions and characteristics of the mentee, mentor, and mentorship within the field experience of teacher education program.

Mentee (Preservice Teacher) and Learning to Teach in the Field Experience

The preservice teacher refers to the student who is simultaneously registered in a program of study in the College of Education, and is achieving all the requirements of the field experience. During the field experience, the preservice teacher complies with the roles designated by the College of Education including, observing the mentor teacher, fulfilling the field experience assignment expectancy, and submitting assignments that exhibit acquired learning. In order to be considered for a practical opportunity at the field experience, the

preservice teacher must have fulfilled all of the coursework and all other requirements of the College of Education (Gallego, 2001).

The field experience is a cornerstone in preservice teachers' education as it familiarizes preservice teachers with the fundamental concepts of teaching and learning and allows them to observe and participate in varied educational settings (Field Experience Handbook, 2014-15). During the field experience, preservice teachers gain proper examples and a holistic understanding of the basic concepts of teaching, associate with people participating in academic arenas, and differentiate between good and bad teachers and classrooms. Moreover, the preservice teachers are expected to listen, interview, observe, reflect, and match their theoretical and practical perspectives of teaching (Wilson et al., 2002). In addition, they develop their understanding of diversity by reflecting on their experiences and by observing students. The successful fulfillment of the coursework and field experience assignments is expected to transform student teachers into teachers and leaders. Preservice teachers learn through different learning settings and activities including, one-to-one with the mentor, small groups of several preservice teachers, and large groups of preservice teachers. This variety in learning settings allows preservice teachers to develop their skills and understanding of teaching while working with students (Field Experience Handbook, 2014-15).

The field experience is intended to be achieved while preservice teachers are working under the direction of mentor teachers in classrooms. Mentors provide the preservice teachers with guidance, feedback and knowledge, and share their professional and personal experiences. Once the new teachers are ready to teach, mentor teachers withdraw gradually. Nevertheless, educators argue that the field experience is not only intended to teach the preservice teachers the professional aspects of teaching but also the social aspects of teaching (Farber, Wilson & Holm,

1989; Liston & Zeichner, 1991). Yet, the social aspects of teaching require preservice teachers to open up and communicate with their mentors to establish satisfactory relationships, and thus achieve the desired outcomes (Clutterbuck, 2004; Gravells, 2006; Shea, 1994). Hudson (2013) concluded that mentors require their preservice teachers to be responsible for their learning, able to reflect on feedback, enthusiastic about teaching, open for relationship building, and committed to students and their learning. Establishing a mentoring relationship in the field experience necessitates the preservice teachers' self-disclosure. Keller (2005) considers self-disclosure a part of the process that enables the relationship to grow, and a sign for the depth of the relationship. Others see it as a specific character that affects the relationship development (Miller, Berg & Archer, 1983). Additionally, research has argued that mentee's self-disclosure correlates positively with the received mentoring, improved mentoring outcomes, and contentment in the relationship with mentors (Wanberg et al., 2007).

Mentor and Mentoring in the Field Experience

In the context of preservice teacher education, a mentor teacher is an influential individual who possesses more knowledge and experience in teaching, and maintains commitment and takes an active role in providing the preservice teachers and less experienced teachers with professional support. Mentors have undeniable influence on the preparation of preservice teachers (Clarke, et al., 2012). Many experienced teachers consider mentoring an opportunity to improve the teaching process, preservice teachers' professional and personal skills, and collegiality (Lai, 2005; McGee, 2001; Walkington, 2005). Others see it as a chance to reflect on their mentoring practices, refresh their enthusiasm for teaching, and improve their professional learning and development (Campbell & Brummett, 2007; Hudson, 2013; Walkington, 2005).

It has been argued that good mentors understand their mentoring responsibilities, and possess the skills and knowledge required to mentor preservice teachers (Graves, 2010). Mentoring requires the mentors to construct and reconstruct knowledge (Tang & Choi, 2007). Accordingly, in the field experience, the skills mentors should possess include problem solving, collaboration, decision making, evaluation, and communication (Gagen & Bowie, 2005; Graves, 2010). In addition, the mentor's experience has a significant influence on the given mentoring. For instance, mentors with long experience are more likely to provide their mentees with more career-related support than mentors with short or no mentoring experience (Allen & Eby, 2004; Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997). Likewise, mentors who view their mentees as more equivalent or proficient will likely provide their mentees with more career-related and psychological assistance (Mullen, 1998). Additionally, mentors who show interest in their mentees' professional development and learning, and encourage open discussion and feedback, provide their mentees with more support (Gravells, 2006).

In the field experience, the mentors' roles include providing appropriate self-explorations, sharing personal and professional experiences, and helping resolve any persisting issues through active listening and feedback. Although the process of mentoring necessitates the practice of information sharing, research has lately studied how the mentors and mentees start such sharing, and what outcomes may emerge from the mentoring relationships as a result of such practice (Ensher & Murphy, 2005; Wanberg et al., 2007). A possible way, in fact, to start such a practice of information sharing in the field experience is self-disclosure. As it refers to the idea of revealing information about oneself to another person, self-disclosure is at the forefront of relationships development and learning (Collins & Miller, 1994).

Interrelationship of Mentoring and Learning to Teach

The term mentoring was originated in the ancient Greek History, specifically in Homer's epic story, the *Odyssey*. When King Odysseus decided to begin his journey in the pursuit of knowledge and adventure, he asked his knowledgeable and devoted servant to mentor his son, Telemachus. The devoted servant agreed and became Telemachus' teacher, guide, role model and friend. Therefore, following the Athen's philosophy, the term "mentoring" has become an indication of having a "father figure" to young people. The term "mentoring" has expanded eventually and included in staff development and organizations; nonetheless, its pristine essence can be found in recent definitions. For instance, while the mentor provided Telemachus with support and became his father figure, mentors nowadays provide their mentees with psychosocial support. Nowadays, however, the mentors may not necessarily be older, but rather more experienced than their mentees.

Since 1980s, schools have implemented mentoring programs to reform and shorten the gap between the theory and practice in preservice teachers' education. Mentoring preservice teachers refers to the process of supporting preservice teachers to improve their teaching performance and strategies. It involves a relationship between an experienced teacher and a novice teacher who engage in a nurturing one-to-one relationship. In such a relationship, the mentor becomes an advisor and role model, and provides the preservice teacher with feedback and guidance (Bigelow, 2002; Haney, 1997).

The process of mentoring starts when novices or less experienced teachers pursue to improve their performance or understanding of certain teaching tasks, so they seek help from their mentors. Carver (2009) argues that in preservice teachers' mentoring programs, the mentors are responsible for enculturating the preservice teachers in the schools environments. This

includes informing the preservice teachers of the schools processes, expectations and rules, and helping them plan a curriculum that matches their students' learning needs. In order to fulfill such responsibilities, according to Carver (2009), the mentors and preservice teachers must work collaboratively on teaching and learning issues by co-teaching, co-planning, and observing each other.

Mentoring necessitates the development of relationships between the mentors and preservice teachers, which in turns improve the professional and personal skills of the preservice teachers. Therefore, the development of relationships is significant to the interaction that takes place between the mentors and preservice teachers in the field experience. In addition, the development of mentoring relationships necessitates communication and trust, and depends on a combination of mentee's and mentor's motives such as the type of relationship, individual characteristics, environmental factors, and career factors (Miller & Jablin, 1991; Morrison, 1993a, b; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Perrewe' et al., 2002). Hill, Bahniuk and Dobos (1989) described mentoring as "a communication relationship in which a senior person supports, tutors, guides, and facilitates a junior person's career development" (p. 15). In dyadic relationships, when the mentors and preservice teachers communicate similarities, interests, beliefs and personalities, their mentoring relationships generate better outcomes. Also, mentoring has been described as a mutual relationship that allows both the mentor and preservice teacher to discuss teaching with each other (Ambrosetti & Dekkers, 2010). In such a relationship, the mentor and preservice teacher maintain dialogue to exchange feedback, and share experiences (Jones, 2001; Maynard, 2000).

According to research, mentoring has benefits for the preservice teachers, mentors and schools. Clutterbuck (2004a) said "I have yet to find anyone who is self-sufficient enough not to

benefit from a mentor at some point in his or her life” (p. 7). Furthermore, Hansford and colleagues’ (2002) review of literature on educational mentoring identified some benefits of mentoring for the preservice teachers, mentors and schools. Table 1 presents the most common benefits of mentoring in the field experience.

Table 1 Benefits of Mentoring for Preservice teachers, Mentors and Schools.

Benefits for PSTs	Benefits for Mentors	Benefits for Schools
Support, encouragement, friendship	Collegiality, collaboration,	Improved education, grades,
Help with teaching strategies/ subject knowledge	networking	behavior of students
Discussing, sharing ideas	Reflection	Support, funds for school
Feedback, constructive criticism	Professional development	Contributes to/good for
Increased self-confidence	Personal satisfaction, reward/ growth	profession
Career affirmation, advancement,	Interpersonal skill development	Less work for principals or staff
commitment	Enjoyment, stimulation,	Retention/continuity of staff
		More effective school leadership

(Taken from Hansford, B. C., Tennent, L. & Ehrich, L. C. (2003). Educational mentoring: Is it worth the effort? *Education Research and Perspectives*, 39(1), pp. 42–75.

<http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00002259/>)

Research Questions

Because the aim of this dissertation is to examine the mentor-mentee self-disclosure during the field experience and its perceived effects on the mentoring relationship development and preservice teachers’ learning to teach, this dissertation attempts to answer the following three questions:

- 1- What are the topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience?

- 2- What are the factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience?
- 3- How do mentors and preservice teachers use self-disclosure as a tool to enhance the mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach?

The following section discusses the theoretical framework. It starts with a discussion of social penetration theory derived from the work of Altman and Taylor (1973), and is followed by a discussion of social exchange theory.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Learning theorists have become more interested in the social aspect of learning (Wilson & Peterson, 2006). Earlier research in psychology has focused on people's learning through silence, and isolated learning from social activities. Contemporary research, on the other hand, has focused on the significance of social activities such as conversation, information sharing, debating, self-disclosure and discussion in the enhancement of learning (Wilson & Peterson, 2006). The two theories, social penetration theory and social exchange theory, upon which this study and its methodology are built, placed learning in access to participating in social activities.

In this study, I argue that learning is a social activity influenced by individual, cultural, contextual, and historical factors (Lewis, Encisco, & Moje, 2007; Wertsch, 1991). Because the mentor-mentee communication in the field experience involves multiple personal and professional motives from both parties, a number of reasons justify using social and interpersonal communication theories in building this study and its methodology. First, when the mentor and preservice teacher interact, they engage in a social system that aims at improving the preservice teacher's teaching skills, and consequently education. Second, this interaction indicates a reciprocal exchange of experiences, knowledge, resources and support from both parties. Third,

the mentoring process serves both the mentor and preservice teacher the most when they perceive it as a cooperative and productive example. Finally, the higher level of communication between the mentor and preservice teacher leads to higher collaboration between them.

Social Penetration Theory

Overview

Social penetration theory (SPT), originated by Altman and Taylor (1973), was built on the dyadic and reciprocal relationships in interpersonal communication. The theory refers to the development of communication during the course of relationship development from being shallow to being deep. Altman and Taylor compared SPT to an onion, arguing that the layers of an onion symbolize different sides of an individual's personality. Whereas the peripheral layers represent a person's public image, the central layers, which can be revealed through communication, represent the inner self. According to Altman and Taylor, relationships differ based on the context and "involve different degrees of social penetration" (p.3). Nevertheless, they pursue an anticipated route.

Social penetration theory involves four assumptions: first, the theory explains the development of relational communication from non-intimate to intimate levels. Although the early conversations may not seem important, they may allow people to create their first impression about each other and provide views for future. Altman and Taylor suggest that "as the relationship progresses, people penetrate slowly through the layers of each other's personality like we peel the layers from an onion" (p.3). Nevertheless, SPT does not claim that all relationships must progress from a non-intimate to intimate stage. Sometimes people pursue to maintain a friendly or professional relationship.

The second assumption, however, concerns the anticipatory aspect of SPT. It has been said that relationships develop orderly and expectedly. Despite the fact that relationships are changing constantly, the theory argues that even such changing relationships go through certain order of development. Factors, such as personality, motives, time and gender may influence the relationship development and change the anticipatory aspect of SPT.

The third assumption of SPT concerns the termination of the relationship development. The process of de-penetration or termination has been described by Altman and Taylor as moving backward from intimacy to non-intimacy. According to Altman and Taylor, this de-penetration or termination is systematic.

The final assumption argues that SPT considers self-disclosure an interactional factor through which interpersonal relationships are formed and developed. According to Altman and Taylor, self-disclosure helps “making self accessible to another person is intrinsically gratifying” (P.50). While the theory describes the relationship formation as a gradual process that moves from non-intimate to intimate areas of the self, and self-disclosure as a dynamic factor that influences relationship development, it also describes the development of interpersonal relationships on a multidimensional level (Altman & Taylor, 1973). According to James (2009), self-disclosure is not a static phenomenon. It is a dynamic process that is simplified by Altman’s and Taylor’s (1973) social penetration theory in Harper and Harper (2006).

Process of Social Penetration Theory

Social penetration theory states that people engage in a reciprocal process of self-disclosure as they are in the process of knowing each other. This process changes in breadth and depth, and impacts the relationship development. Breadth refers to the variety of subjects discussed. Depth, however, refers to how sensitive or personal the disclosed information is, and

consists of three layers including the peripheral layer, the intermediate layer, and the central layer. While, the peripheral layer includes biographical information, the intermediate layer includes personal opinions, beliefs and attitudes. The central layer, on the other hand, includes moral values, self-concepts and fears (Greene et al., 2006). Though certain circumstances may cause a quick expansion in the breadth and/ or depth of self-disclosure, Altman and Taylor (1973) suggest that “as the relationship progresses, people penetrate slowly through the layers of each other’s personality like we peel the layers from an onion” (p.3).

Based on the theory, breadth and depth have an influence on relationship development. For example, changes in peripheral layers have less influence on relationship than changes in the central layers. For instance, if a mentor teacher changes his belief about a fundamental value, such as “the freedom of speech”, the relationship with his preservice teacher will be more affected than if a mentor teacher changes his computer. Accordingly, the higher the levels of breadth and depth of individuals’ self-disclosure may lead to the better interpersonal relationships.

Additionally, Altman and Taylor explained the role self-disclosure plays in interpersonal communication by examining four stages of relational development (orientation, exploratory affective exchange, affective exchange, and stable exchange). During the first stage, individuals only share superficial information; during the second stage, individuals reveal information that may not be revealed during the orientation stage; during the third stage, individuals open up and reveal more to and learn more from each other; during the final stage, individuals continue their openness to each other.

Application of Social Penetration Theory

Social penetration theory helps understand the relationship development between the mentors and preservice teachers during the field experience through its four stages, and draws attention to the importance of informal communication in establishing trusting relationships, and creating positive learning environments where both the mentor and preservice teacher can share their experiences and learn from each other. To establish an effective mentoring relationship in the field experience, it is assumed that interpersonal communication penetrates through these four stages to allow both the mentor and preservice teacher to open up to each other, and thus, exchange constructive experiences and feedback. By mentoring preservice teachers, mentors may establish relationships with preservice teachers that not only benefit the preservice teachers personally and professionally but also model the mentorship. Furthermore, exchanging disclosures allows the mentors to learn more about their preservice teachers' personal lives while disclosing their personal experiences, and thus enhance the mentoring process. In addition, the more self-disclosure the mentor and preservice teacher exchange leads to the more liking, closeness and similarities. This may help both the mentor and preservice teacher establish and maintain a positive relationship that allows both of them to share experiences, knowledge and feedback, and consequently enhance learning and professional development. On the other hand, the less self-disclosure the mentor and preservice teacher exchange leads to the less liking, closeness and similarities. Thus, the mentoring relationship may deteriorate or diminish which may lead to less sharing of experiences, knowledge and feedback and may negatively influence the preservice teachers' learning to teach.

Nonetheless, research suggests that the processes of mentoring relationships from both the mentors' and preservice teachers' sides have become the focus of mentoring literature

(Dougherty & Dreher, 2007; Fletcher & Ragins, 2007; Wanberg, Welsh, & Hezlett, 2003). As a result, SPT is central to the mentoring process as it provides a theoretical base for the relationship development between the mentors and preservice teachers in the field experience. Nevertheless, SPT is relatively dated, and has not been updated or used as a basis for any current theory. Moreover, SPT does not specify how personal a mentor and preservice teacher should be in order to sustain a functional mentoring relationship. In addition, SPT does not draw a limit of intimacy between the mentor and preservice teacher in order to keep their mentoring relationship professional. These gaps in SPT are explored by interviewing and observing the research participants, and discussed in the coming chapters.

Following this theory, I explored the effects of self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship development and preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience. In terms of research design, data collection and data analysis, the concepts of SPT guide my interview questions and allowed me "to enter into the other person's perspective" (Patton, 2002, p. 341) to understand the phenomenon (the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in field experience) from both the mentors' and preservice teachers' perspectives (Falk & Blumenreich, 2005). See Appendices (A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³, C and D).

Social Exchange Theory

Overview

Social exchange theory (SET), originated in different fields, such as social psychology and sociology (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960; Homans, 1958), was built on the idea that people reason their relationships in economic ways (costs and rewards). Costs refer to the negative sequences of a relationship. For example, the mentor discloses private information and the preservice teacher takes advantage of such information, and vice versa. Rewards, on the other

hand, refer to the positive sequences of a relationship. For example, the mentor discloses information that hones the preservice teacher's teaching skills and renews the mentor's enthusiasm for teaching.

Social exchange theory explains the exchanged behaviors in social relationships (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Homans, 1958), which may include "tangible and intangible" characteristics (Homans, 1958). Tangible characteristics may include support and help, meanwhile intangible characteristics may include agreement and respect. According to Homans, individuals in such relationships evaluate the cost and benefit of participating and sharing with the other members. Blau (1964) further explains, based on the concept of social exchange theory, how individuals expect returns for the support they provide for the other. Moreover, Homans explains how members of such social exchange try to increase their profits or rewards from participating in the relationships. Likewise, Blau argues that individuals tend to participate more in such relationships when the profit is high, meanwhile they tend to withdraw when the profit is low.

Gouldner (1960) reports three forms of reciprocity in social exchanges. The first form is interdependent exchange which involves individuals experience mutual dependence on each other. The second form is "folk belief" which includes a culture or people sharing a certain faith about reciprocity. The third form is the "norm of reciprocity" which involves a moral standard about human behavior. In a mentoring context, for example, the norm of reciprocity necessitates the preservice teacher to reciprocate to the mentor, as the mentor shared or helped the preservice teacher, and vice versa. According to Gouldner (1960), the norm of reciprocity necessitates individuals to reciprocate, and encourages individuals to participate in social exchanges like sharing experiences and supporting each other.

Because the norm of reciprocity necessitates but does not guarantee reciprocating to the other, Blau (1964) believes that this incertitude may establish trust between the both individuals in the relationship. According to Blau, this trust results from the spontaneity of social exchange. Also, Molm and colleagues (2000) examined commitment and trust in reciprocal versus negotiated exchanges, and concluded that commitment and trust are more probably to become mature in reciprocal exchanges than negotiated exchanges; nevertheless, they become mature overtime. Commitment and trust in reciprocal exchanges develop as the relationship continues and as both individuals in the relationship trust each other and decide to reciprocate. Additionally, Molm (2003) examined the importance of reciprocity in reciprocal versus negotiated exchanges, and concluded that individuals in reciprocal exchange ascribe more importance to the act than the level of reciprocity. According to Molm, this is because the act of reciprocity improves trust in the other, and leads to other rewards such as appreciation by the other.

Process of Social Exchange Theory

In a mentoring context, the process of social exchange theory starts when individuals decide whether to leave or stay in mentoring relationships. This decision involves two kinds of comparisons including comparison level and comparison level alternatives (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Whereas the former (CL) refers to what benefits people want to receive and what costs they anticipate to pay as a result of engaging in mentoring relationships, the latter (CLalt) refers to how individuals weigh mentoring relationships against the realistic alternatives to those relationships. CLalt concerns stability rather than satisfaction in relationships. For example, if a preservice teacher has no substitute to an unfit mentoring relationship, and fears being alone at

the beginning of his/ her teaching career, based on SET, the preservice teacher will choose to stay in such a mentoring relationship.

Further, SET explains exchange relationships in mentoring settings. For example, Ensher, Thomas and Murphy (2001) applied the concepts of social exchange theory (costs and benefits) to study the effects of mentors' support on mentees' satisfaction. Ensher and colleagues reported that the reciprocity of self-disclosure as well as the role modeling and professional support were key factors in predicting the mentees' satisfaction with their mentors. Moreover, mentees' satisfaction varied based on the type of mentoring received. Therefore, Ensher and colleagues concluded that the traditional mentors provided the mentees with more satisfaction in the mentoring relationships than did the peer mentors. Based on social exchange theory, traditional mentors share more experiences and learning resources with mentee than peer mentors. Similarly, Young and Perrewé (2000) used social exchange theory to study the mentoring relationships, and offered a framework to explain the processes involved in the development and maintenance of the mentoring relationships.

Application of Social Exchange Theory

Research has described the concept of mentoring as 'both a relationship and a process' (Kwan & Lopez, 2005, p.276), and as a dialogue (Heikkinen, Jokinen, & Tynjälä, 2008). Bransford and colleagues (1999) defined mentoring as a multidimensional activity in which experienced teachers support new teachers' progress through training and theory development. During the field experience, before the mentors and preservice teachers engage in mentoring relationships, they assess the costs and rewards of sharing personal and professional information. Mentors and preservice teachers share work-related successes, concerns, failures, and other personal and professional information. On the other hand, they may refrain from sharing

devaluating experiences or sensitive information such as sexual orientation or criminal records. If the mentors and preservice teachers perceive the mentoring relationships as rewarding, they may engage in more self-disclosure which will allow the mentoring relationships to strengthen, and consequently maximizes the preservice teachers' learning to teach. On the other hand, if the mentors and preservice teachers perceive the mentoring relationships as not rewarding or costing, they may engage in less self-disclosure which will allow the mentoring relationship to deteriorate, and consequently minimizes the preservice teachers' learning to teach.

Maintaining personal and professional disclosures between the mentors and preservice teachers may welcome preservice teachers into teaching, and provide them with the needed experiences and tools to survive the difficulties preservice teachers encounter in the beginning of their teaching career. According to Franke and Dahlgren (1996), this will explain how mentor teachers help or fail to help new teachers feel comfortable, and learn the practice and culture of teaching. Moreover, such disclosures may support the mentors' involvement in preservice teachers' difficulties as well as learning the ways preservice teachers use to overcome such difficulties. Ensher and Murphy (2005) argue that self-disclosure reinforces the connections between the mentor and preservice teacher as the relationship changes and flourishes from being weak to being strong, which in turns allows discussion about one's work performance.

Nonetheless, social exchange theory does not provide a clear definition of its major concepts (reward and cost), which makes the theory difficult to test. Moreover, SET assumes that people are intelligent calculators, computing the rewards and costs before engaging in any relationship. Also, SET does not separate between what individuals perceive as valuable or as rewarding. For example, being honest to a mentor teacher may be seen valuable, but it may not be rewarding. These gaps in SET are explored by interviewing and observing the research

participants, and discussed in the coming chapters. In addition, this study expanded this theory in the context of the field experience of teacher education.

Following this theory, I explored the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship development and preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience. In terms of research design, data collection and data analysis, the concepts of SET guided my interview questions and observation sessions, and allowed me to understand the motifs of the mentors' and preservice teachers' disclosures (See Appendices A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³, C and D).

Summary

Besides providing an overview of the present study, this chapter has provided the theoretical framework for this study, specifically social penetration theory (SPT) and social exchange theory (SET). The first section of this chapter presented an overview featuring the importance of communication between the mentors and mentees in a variety of disciplines in general and in the field experience in specific. A special emphasis was given to the mentor-mentee self-disclosure and how it has been viewed and used in different mentoring contexts. Also, this section provided an introduction of some overarching topics of mentoring, and the purpose of the study along with the research questions. The second section of Chapter One presented the theoretical framework upon which this study was built. It started with a discussion of social penetration theory derived from the work of Altman and Taylor (1973), and social exchange theory. The following chapter provided a review of the most relevant and important literature on mentor-mentee self-disclosure.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON SELF-DISCLOSURE

Chapter Two provides a review of the most relevant and important literature on the mentor-mentee self-disclosure. The first section of Chapter Two begins by providing the framework upon which the topics of the literature were selected, and a rationale for the selection of literature. The second section, which makes the bulk of this chapter, outlines a review of the most relevant and important studies that examined the mentor-mentee self-disclosure. An emphasis is given to the studies that are related to self-disclosure between the mentor teachers and preservice teachers in the field experiences. The studies in this section focus on preservice teachers' learning in the field experience, mentee's and mentor's self-disclosure, self-disclosure and mentoring relationship development, and self-disclosure and learning to teach. A summary of each category or set of studies is provided to show the common and uncommon denominators between the studies. The final section provides a summary of the review and explains how the literature helps generate the three research questions.

Conceptual Framework

Earlier in 1970s, Cozby defined self-disclosure as “any information about himself which a Person A communicates verbally to a Person B” (p. 73) and “they would be unlikely to know otherwise” (Spence, Fox, Golding, & Daiches, 2012, p. 179). Cozby described self-disclosure as a continuous process of information sharing that involves varying degrees of “breadth and depth” (p. 73). As a result, self-disclosure affects both the person who discloses the information and the person who receives it. Since the purpose of this study is to examine the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship development and preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience, Cozby's theoretical perspective provides points of

departure. This review is organized around four major self-disclosure topics as follows: 1) preservice teachers learning to teach in the field experience; 2) mentee's and mentor's self-disclosure; 3) self-disclosure and mentoring relationship development; and 4) self-disclosure and learning to teach.

Selection of Literature

Due to the scarcity of empirical studies on the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, studies from disciplines other than teacher education and mentoring were adopted including entrepreneur, supervision, and social psychology field. Another reason for including studies from such disciplines is the relational nature between the expert-novice which resembles the one between the mentor and preservice teacher. I excluded articles from the field of psychotherapy because the relational nature between the therapist-patient is different from the one between the mentor and preservice teacher. To find the most relevant and important articles, I searched the electronic databases of Google Scholar, ERIC and Scopus for keywords such as, "self-disclosure", "mentor", "mentee", "preservice teacher" and "mentoring". Furthermore, I used the snowball searching techniques for phrases such as, "mentor self-disclosure", "mentee self-disclosure", "self-disclosure and learning", "reciprocity of self-disclosure", "supervisee-supervisor self-disclosure" and "the role of self-disclosure in relationships" in titles or abstracts. The searching process included articles from 1960 till present.

I first reviewed four articles that examined preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience. Next, I reviewed 11 articles that examined and compared the topics, purposes and factors of the mentee's and mentor's self-disclosure. I then reviewed ten articles that explored the influence of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship

development. Finally, I reviewed six articles that examined the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach.

Preservice Teachers' Learning in the Field Experience

Several studies have looked at the interactions in the field placement. These studies have examined the effects of the interactions between PSTs, mentors and university supervisors on the PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience (Lampert et al., 2013; Lu, 2013; Sanderson, 2003; Valencia et al., 2009).

Sanderson (2003) studied the effects of the interactions between the mentors and preservice teachers on the PSTs' teaching knowledge and skills by examining the outcomes of a survey completed by 57 mentors from several school districts. Besides hospitably allowing the PSTs in their classrooms, the mentors shared their teaching stories to reduce the PSTs' anxiety and concerns. Other findings indicated that the mentors used different strategies to enculturate the PSTs into teaching. Moreover, the mentors explained the assignments PSTs had to complete before the beginning of the semester to guarantee an easy and prolific teaching experience. In addition, the mentors provided the PSTs with strategies to learn including, observing, journaling and modeling as well as offering advice about the proper ways to integrate into the classrooms.

Valencia and colleagues (2009) examined the effects of the triadic interactions between the PSTs, mentors and university supervisors on the PSTs' opportunities to learn to teach language arts during the field experience. This study was part of a longitudinal study in which Valencia and her colleagues shadowed art teachers from their last year in teacher education program into their first 3 years of teaching. A total of 25 participants (nine preservice teachers, nine mentors, and seven university supervisors) underwent several interviews and observation sessions to understand their perception of the issue. The findings indicated that the three parties

were concurrently working in different directions and confronting different challenges. Therefore, the PSTs frequently lost the opportunities to learn to teach as a result of receiving scarce feedback on methods courses, teaching subject materials, and pedagogical knowledge.

In a mixed method study, Lampert and colleagues (2013) examined the interaction between the PSTs, mentors and subject matter, and developed a model for teacher education which they called "rehearsal." The model aims at providing the mentors and PSTs with a method to interact and communicate about teaching; such a method is not only open for analysis but also rooted in practice. Lampert and colleagues specified four stages for their model "rehearsal," including observation, collective analysis, preparation, and rehearsal. The results from their quantitative analyses indicated that applying "rehearsal" in the field experience not only allowed the PSTs to discuss different aspects of teaching concurrently but also discussed them in connection to each other. Moreover, directive feedback was the most frequently occurring form of their interaction, through which the mentors provided the rehearsing PSTs with guidance. On the other hand, the results from their qualitative analyses focused on stimulating and responding to the PSTs' thoughts for two reasons. First, stimulating and responding was considered a major factor of ambitious teaching. Second, stimulating and responding was the most frequently occurring form of exchanges between the mentors and PSTs.

Lu (2013) conducted a phenomenological study to examine some PSTs' concerns and problems regarding to their interaction with the mentors in the field experience. A total of 23 participants (eight preservice teachers, seven mentors, and eight university supervisors) underwent two individual semi-structured interviews to understand their perception of the issue. The findings referred to five major concerns and problems PSTs endured while interacting with their mentors during the field experience including, inappropriate teaching opportunity,

ineffective communication, poor classroom practices, wrong perception of the preservice teacher's role, and interrupting teaching. In addition, the findings referred to four possible solutions: being flexible in facing problems, being communicative, being respectful, and being professional.

In summary, this body of research described the effects of the interactions between the PSTs, mentors and university supervisors on the PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. Besides motivating, enculturating and providing PSTs with directive feedback, such interaction created a positive environment which allowed the PSTs to work side by side with the mentors to learn all the aspects related to teaching. On the other hand, the absence of such interaction minimized the PSTs' opportunity to learn to teach as a result of the lack of the feedback received on methods courses, teaching subject materials and pedagogical knowledge.

During the field experience, the PSTs, mentors and university supervisors interact formally and informally. Yet, this body of research examined the effects of the formal interaction between the PSTs, mentors and university supervisors on the PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience and ignored the informal aspect of their interaction such as self-disclosure. This necessitates studying the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience. Next section examined and compared the topics, purposes and factors of the mentee's and mentor's self-disclosure.

Mentee's and Mentor's Self-Disclosure

Another body of literature examined the role self-disclosure played within the contexts of counselor supervision and teacher education. In particular, it studied the topics, purposes and factors of teacher self-disclosure (Derlega & Grzelak, 1979; Downs, Javidi & Nussbaum, 1988; Gregory, 2005; Holladay, 1984; Javidi & Long, 1989; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999;

Ladany & Melincoff, 1999; Ladany, Walker, & Melicoff, 2001; Rosenfeld & Kendrick, 1984; Walsh et al., 2002; Webb & Wheeler, 1998).

Topics of Mentors' and Mentees' Self-Disclosure

Topics of teacher self-disclosure, whether personal or professional, were always perceived as indispensable elements in teacher self-disclosure. As a result, research (Downs, Javidi & Nussbaum, 1988; Gregory, 2005; Holladay, 1984; Javidi & Long, 1989; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Ladany, Walker, & Melicoff, 2001; Walsh et al., 2002; Webb & Wheeler, 1998) studied the topics of TSD that included education, teaching experience, family, friends, beliefs/opinions, leisure activities, personal problems, hobbies, favorite food, and personal characteristics.

The research on topics of teacher self-disclosure was coined by Holladay (1984) in which he requested students to report the occurrence of their teachers' SD. Holladay concluded that the most recurrent topics of teacher self-disclosure were about their personal and/or professional life. Whereas the personal topics of teacher self-disclosure included information about family, friends, beliefs and opinions, leisure activities, and personal problems, the professional topics of teacher-disclosure included information about education and teaching experience.

In the study of the effects of teacher implementation of humor, self-disclosure, and narratives as verbal activities in classroom, Down and colleagues (1988) observed 57 college instructors' classes. Each disclosed information was studied and categorized into topics of instructors' self-disclosure including, education, experience, family, friends/colleagues, beliefs and/or opinions, leisure activities, and personal problems. Down and colleagues found that instructor's beliefs/ opinions was the most recurrent topic of instructor self-disclosure. Additionally, instructors self-disclosed in an average of ten times per class.

In another study of the effects of teacher implementation of humor, self-disclosure, and narratives as verbal activities in classroom, Javidi and Long (1989) observed veteran and novice college instructors' classes and compared their use of the three activities. Although both groups of instructors implemented the three activities in their classes, veteran instructors used the three activities more often than the novice instructors. Javidi and Long also categorized the topics of teacher self-disclosure into: education and experience; family, friends and colleagues; beliefs and opinions; leisure activities; and personal problems.

Other research concerned the appropriateness of the topics of teacher self-disclosure. For example, in the study of the effects of teacher self-disclosure on perceived teacher caring, solidarity, empowerment, and students outcomes, Minger (2004) tested a solidarity empowerment causal model by surveying 282 graduate students from 14 different classes. Minger's results indicated that the topics of teacher self-disclosure would be considered acceptable, if they included information about hobbies, favorite foods, educational background, personal characteristics, and happiest moments. Nonetheless, the results also indicated that the topics of teacher self-disclosure would be considered unacceptable, if they included information about sexual intimacy or romantic relationships.

In the study of the effects of teacher self-disclosure on students' learning and attitudes, Gregory (2005) measured college students' perception of their instructors' self-disclosure on the basis of acceptable or unacceptable. Gregory found that instructor's education, instructor's professional experience, and instructor's clarifying of the course material were considered acceptable topics of teacher self-disclosure. Meanwhile, sexuality, sexual practices, attractiveness, religious beliefs/practices, personal problems, drug or alcohol use, and political beliefs were considered unacceptable topics of teacher self-disclosure.

Supervisors' disclosure, whether revealed or not during supervisory sessions, have been examined. For example, Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman (1999) examined the topics and occurrence of supervisors' disclosure, working alliance and supervisory style, and stated that it was not unlikely for supervisors to share personal and professional experiences with their supervisees. Such disclosure included supervisors' attitudes to supervisees and clients, training, clinical difficulties, and successful and failure experiences. As a result, Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman classified the topics of supervisors' self-disclosure into six categories: a) personal experiences; b) struggling experiences; c) successful experiences; d) professional experiences; e) attitudes toward clients and supervisees; and f) neutral experiences which involved similar circumstances that had managed by supervisors.

Purposes of Mentors' and Mentees' Self-Disclosure

Other research focused on understanding the functionality of teacher self-disclosure in classroom (Derlega & Grzelak, 1979; Downs, Javidi & Nussbaum, 1988; Gregory, 2005; Rosenfeld & Kendrick, 1984). For example, Derlega and Grzelak (1979) examined the practical features of self-disclosure and insisted on the need to study why people self-disclose. Derlega and Grzelak reported five purposes of self-disclosure including, explain and simplify ideas, develop or sustain relationships, self-express or release emotions, gain feedback, and obtain control.

Rosenfeld and Kendrick (1984) examined the influence of the relationship between the person who discloses information and the person who received it on the purpose of their self-disclosure. Rosenfeld and Kendrick reported different purposes for disclosing to friends and strangers. For example, disclosing to friends was meant to sustain or strengthen relationship,

reciprocate, and self-explain. On the other hand, disclosing for strangers was meant to impress and reciprocate.

In the aforementioned study of the effects of implementing humor, self-disclosure, and narratives as verbal activities in classroom, Down and colleagues (1988) observed 57 college instructors' classes, and reported that college instructors self-disclosed their information to simplify and explain course material, and stimulate discussions. They also reported that some instructors self-disclosed for irrelevant purposes to course material. Although the results showed that teachers commonly self-disclosed to simplify and explain course material as it accounted (70%), and stimulate discussions as it accounted (18%), only few teachers self-disclosed for irrelevant purposes to course material as it accounted (12%).

In the aforementioned study of the effects of teacher self-disclosure on students' learning and attitudes, Gregory (2005) asked 50 college instructors about the purposes of their self-disclosure. Gregory reported five main purposes of teacher SD including, simplifying course material, connecting course material to the real world, building rapport with students, creating comfortable learning environment, and expressing biases. Moreover, Gregory reported other purposes of teacher self-disclosure in classroom, such as applying the course material, raising students' awareness, and permitting students' emotions.

Factors that Enhance Mentors' and Mentees' Self-Disclosure

Webb and Wheeler (1998) examined the relationship between supervisee's self-disclosure and factors like working alliance, environmental factors, and trainee status. A total of 96 supervisees were requested to disclose any personal or professional thoughts and feelings related to their clients. This included attraction to clients or supervisee's feelings of being incompetent as a counselor. The results indicated that: a) supervisees' willingness to disclose

correlated positively with their perception of the working alliance; b) participants tended to disclose less in a group format than an individual supervision; c) supervisees who selected their supervisors tended to disclose more sensitive and personal experiences about themselves and their clients; and d) work setting correlated negatively with supervisees' self-disclosure.

Similarly, Walsh and colleagues (2002) examined the factors that influence the supervisees' willingness to share personal and professional experiences with their supervisors. Such factors included clinical mistakes, attitudes toward clients, and perception of their counseling abilities. Walsh and colleagues concluded that the supervisory relationship was the major determinant of supervisees' willingness to self-disclose. Furthermore, being negatively evaluated after making mistakes affected supervisees' readiness to self-disclose. Consequently, supervisors who disclosed their mistakes, implemented a reciprocal and collaborative supervisory philosophy, and showed interest in their supervisees' personal and professional success, established a supervisory relationship which encouraged the supervisees to self-disclose.

In summary, this body of literature covered the topics, purposes and factors of self-disclosure in the context of counselor supervision and teacher education. The topics of mentor-mentee self-disclosure included information about education, working experience, family, friends, beliefs/opinions, leisure activities, personal problems and hobbies. Meanwhile, they self-disclosed to explain and simplify ideas, develop or sustain relationships, self-express or release emotions, gain feedback, and obtain control. On the other hand, the factors that influenced the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in a counselor supervision setting related to supervisees' mistakes, implementing a collaborative supervisory philosophy, showing interest in the supervisees' personal and professional success, and establishing a supervisory relationship which encouraged the supervisees to self-disclose.

In a teacher education context, no research has examined the topics, purposes and factors of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience. Therefore, it is necessary to study the topics, purposes and factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, and whether such variables facilitate or hinder the mentoring process and PSTs' learning to teach. Next section examined the influence of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship development.

Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development

Several studies have explored the effects of exchanging disclosure on relationship development. Specifically, they have examined the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on creating trust and respect, and increasing liking and closeness between the mentors and mentees (e.g., Collins & Miller, 1994; Dindia, 2002; Hudson, 2013; Knox et al., 2011; Ladany et al., 2003; Laurenceau et al., 1998; Monsour & Corman, 1991; Sprecher, Treger, & Wondra, 2012; Sprecher et al., 2013; Wrench & Punyanunt, 2004).

Trust and Respect

To begin, Monsour and Corman (1991) suggested that when the mentor and mentee communicate properly, a mentoring relationship is established. The mentor in such a relationship shares information and experiences, and monitors the performance of the required skills. Monsour and Corman concluded that the best mentoring relationship is the one that is built on trust and respect.

Further, Ladany and colleagues (2003) reviewed multiple case studies and came up with a supervisor self-disclosure model. The aim of this model was to offer supervisors an agenda to decide the usefulness of self-disclosure in supervision. Ladany and colleagues suggested that self-disclosure not only facilitated the processes of supervision but also helped the trainees

memorize them. Moreover, supervisor's self-disclosure influenced the emotional element of the supervisory agreement. Additionally, supervisor's self-disclosure motivated the trainee to self-disclose by ensuring trust and respect, modeling and explaining how to utilize self-disclosure in creating successful relationships in supervision contexts.

Using qualitative research, Knox et al. (2011) examined the supervisees' experiences of supervisors' self-disclosure (SRSD) by interviewing twelve graduate-level supervisees. They reported a variety of experiences, including self-doubt, tension in the supervisory relationship, and difficult clinical situation followed by the supervisors' disclosures about personal information or clinical experiences. Yet, SRSD had positive impact, and the supervisees perceived their supervisors' disclosure as a method to normalize as well as to establish relationships based on trust and respect.

In an attempt to identify ways of forming positive mentor-mentee relationships, Hudson (2013) conducted a multi-case study in which more than 200 white female PSTs were asked about their understanding of forming mentoring relationships. Data collection included written responses from 200 PSTs, recorded focus group interviews and written responses from 19 mentor teachers, and recorded interviews from two pairs of PSTs and mentors. The results indicated that sharing experiences, information, and resources leads to creating trust and respect, and consequently sets the foundations of relationship development between the PSTs and their mentors.

Closeness and Liking

In the study of the effects of interpersonal communication on advisee-advisor mentoring relationship, Wrench and Punyanunt (2004) examined the effects of interpersonal communication on the advisor-advisee relationship, and amount of received mentoring. One

hundred fifty-three graduate students from different majors were contacted electronically and asked to provide answers regarding their relationships with the advisors. The results showed that advisees' views of the usefulness of the advisor-advisee relationship accounted 39%, and the amount of received mentoring an advisee received accounted 55%. In other words, the degree to which advisees felt mentored correlated positively with advisees' understanding of their advisors' communication skills. Similarly, advisors' level of closeness and liking correlated positively with advisees' understanding of advisors' skills, kindness, and honesty.

The significance of individual's reaction to self-disclosure was found in a study conducted by Laurenceau et al. (1998), in which participants were required to report any social communication instantly for seven days. The participants reported higher levels of closeness when both individuals interacted in giving and receiving self-disclosure. Additionally significant, was how the other person in the interaction was perceived as being accepting such closeness.

Furthermore, Collins and Miller (1994) conducted a meta-analytic review to study the influence self-disclosure has on the mentor-mentee relationship development and maintenance by documenting the links between self-disclosure and liking. The results indicated significant connections between relationship closeness and self-disclosure. Moreover, Collins and Miller suggested that "people disclose more to whom they like, people like more who discloses to them, and people like more to whom they have disclosed personal information." Additionally, the relation between liking and disclosure was moderated by some variables, including the type of disclosure, the gender of the disclosers and the study paradigm.

In other meta-analyses, Dindia (2002) discussed the reciprocity of self-disclosure in relationships. In fact, the information gained from these analyses supports the idea of the reciprocity of self-disclosure both at the initial and the advanced phases of the relationships.

Additionally, the reciprocity of self-disclosure seems to be an important factor in the processes of developing and maintaining the relationship.

In the study of the influence of the reciprocity of self-disclosure (vs. non-reciprocity) on liking, Sprecher et al. (2013) conducted an experiment that included unfamiliar individuals working in sets of dyads and participating in a controlled self-disclosure activity. In some dyads, individuals asked and received questions. Meanwhile, individuals either asked or received questions in other dyads, and swapped tasks in the later interaction. Participants who asked and received questions described higher levels of liking and closeness than those who either asked or received questions. Though individuals in non-reciprocal interactions changed tasks, the dissimilarities did not disappear after the later interaction. Therefore, Sprecher et al. came to the conclusion that participating in reciprocal self-disclosure would likely to increase liking and closeness.

In another experiment, Sprecher et al. (2012) studied an interrelated but different topic of the reciprocity of self-disclosure: whether giving or receiving self-disclosure created varied levels of liking and perceived similarities. Fifty-nine pairs of unfamiliar university students participated in a controlled self-disclosure activity, in which one student disclosed whereas the other student listened in the initial interaction; students swapped tasks in the later interaction. Participants who disclosed in the initial interaction reported fewer degrees of liking than those who listened. Once participants swapped parts and shared disclosures, liking levels increased.

In summary, this body of literature described the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship development. Self-disclosure created trust and respect, which were the basis of the mentor-mentee relationship development. In addition, exchanging disclosures raised the likelihood of liking and closeness between the mentors and mentees.

Therefore, self-disclosure seemed to be an important factor in the processes of developing and maintaining mentoring relationships.

Nonetheless, no research has examined the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship development in the field experience. Therefore, it is imperative to examine the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on variables such as trust, respect, liking and closeness. Such variables set the foundations of relationship development between the PSTs and their mentors during the field experience. In addition, the lack of literature necessitates studying the process both the mentors and PSTs use of self-disclosure as a tool to establish mentoring relationships in the field experience.

Self-Disclosure and Learning to Teach

Several studies have looked at how the communication between the mentor and PST may lead to the PST's learning. Specifically, they have examined how these conversations can be understood and used to enculturate the PST in the teaching profession (e.g., Bradbury & Koballa, 2008; Wang et al., 2004).

To begin, Wang, Strong and Odell (2004) observed four pairs of mentors and novice teachers (two pairs from U.S. and the other two from China) to examine the effects of the mentor-novice conversations on the novice teachers' learning to teach. Wang et al. analyzed and compared the subjects and types of their conversations regarding new teachers' lessons. The results showed differences in the type and focus of the conversations between the Chinese and U.S. pairs. Nevertheless, these dissimilarities were linked to the different styles and structures of teaching, mentoring and curriculum in each country. Furthermore, the conversations between the mentor and the new teacher either facilitated or limited the new teacher's chances to learn to teach.

The importance of mentor-novice communication in the field experience is described in Bradbury's and Koballa's (2008) study, in which they identified the sources of tension in the mentoring programs. One of those is the mentors' inability to share their teaching beliefs and experiences with others. Bradbury and Koballa outlined other concerns that may arise as a result of the inability to share knowledge and experiences, and concluded that inadequate communication between the mentors and preservice teachers would not prepare preservice teachers to face the conflict between the reality of teaching and their expectations, and consequently they would reject adaptation.

Other research has studied the effects of exchanging disclosure on learning, and examined how mentor-mentee self-disclosure either facilitates or hinders the mentees' learning and professional development (e.g., Christ, 2004; St-Jean, 2012; St-Jean & Mathieu, 2011; Wanberg et al., 2007).

Wanberg et al. (2007) explored the role mentor-mentee self-disclosure dyads plays in expecting the mentoring outcomes for the mentee. During a formal mentoring program, a total of 75 pairs of mentors and mentees were surveyed regarding the mentees' learning and planning and career development. The results revealed that the mentors and mentees self-disclosed their experiences repeatedly during the mentoring program; however, the mentors disclosed less than their mentees. Additionally, the mentees' self-disclosure was linked to the positive impact of mentoring, and mentoring received. Meanwhile, the mentors' self-disclosure was not.

In the study of the effects of mentoring on mentee's learning, St-Jean and Mathieu (2011) examined the role mentees' self-disclosure plays in generating mentoring outcomes by applying a structural equation model on 360 entrepreneurs. The results indicated that self-disclosure was an important component of successful mentoring as it allowed the mentors to utilize better

career-related, role-model, and psychological purposes and consequently improved mentees' learning.

In another study of the effects of mentoring on mentee's learning, St-Jean (2012) studied the connections between self-disclosure, functions, and novices' outcomes by using a structural equation model on 360 entrepreneurs. The results indicated that three purposes contributed to entrepreneurs' learning, career-related purposes, psychological purposes, and role model purposes. Additionally, trust and perceived similarity as mediating factors may foster these three purposes through mentees' self-disclosure and thus improve their learning.

Likewise, Christ (2004) examined how student-mentor pairs learned and how they assisted others' learning by documenting the experiences of fifteen mentee-mentor pairs in The Effective Mentoring in English Education (EMEE) project. Christ concluded that communication, specifically self-disclosure and social interaction not only provided student teachers with constructive feedback, but also with the knowledge necessary to succeed in the early stages of their teaching career.

In summary, this body of literature pointed out the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the mentees' learning. Self-disclosure seems to be an effective tool that can be used by both the mentors and mentees to improve the mentees' learning through sharing experiences, feedback and knowledge. Moreover, self-disclosure and social interaction seem connected and required to establish a mentor-mentee relationship through which the mentees' learning occurs. Yet, no research has examined the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. This necessitates examining the ways both the PSTs and their mentors use self-disclosure as a tool to enhance the PSTs' learning to teach in the field

experience. Also, the lack of research necessitates studying how such disclosure either facilitate or hinder the PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience.

Summary

This review was conducted to examine the mentor-mentee self-disclosure and its effects on the mentoring relationship development and preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience. A review of teacher education literature showed a lack of empirical studies related to the role self-disclosure plays in the mentoring relationships and the preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience. Therefore, studies from disciplines other than teacher education and mentoring were adopted such as entrepreneur learning, counselor supervision and education, and social psychology. The findings, however, provided evidence that the reciprocity of self-disclosure raises the likelihood of perceived similarities, liking, and the connection between the mentors and mentees. Also, self-disclosure is an effective tool or agenda by which mentors share their experiences, knowledge and feedback, and consequently enhance mentees' learning.

Furthermore, self-disclosure plays an important role in creating trust and respect between the mentors and preservice teachers, which are the basis of the mentoring relationship development and maintenance. Finally, the topics of self-disclosure included personal experiences, struggling experiences, successful and professional experiences, and neutral experiences which involved similar circumstances that had managed by supervisors. These findings have been repeatedly obtained throughout the literature. Therefore, this review drew a connection between the mentor-mentee self-disclosure and mentoring relationship development and mentees' professional development and learning. The more self-disclosure the mentor and mentee had exchanged led to more liking, closeness and similarities. Self-disclosure, in fact, helped both the mentor and mentee establish and maintain a positive relationship that allowed

both of them to share experiences, knowledge and feedback, and consequently enhanced learning and professional development. On the other hand, the less self-disclosure the mentor and mentee had exchanged led to less liking, closeness and similarities. Thus, the mentor-mentee relationship deteriorated or diminished which led to less sharing of experiences, knowledge and feedback, and consequently negatively influenced learning and professional development.

Although most of the studies included in this review were not from the fields of teacher education or mentoring, the findings can be extended to the mentor-preservice teacher self-disclosure and its effects on the mentoring relationships and PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. In fact, both the mentor's and the PST's disclosure may likely influence the way they like each other for several reasons. Clearly, the mentor and the PST may feel liked and trusted, they may feel that their ideas are appreciated by each other, and that self-disclosure may communicate interest in knowing each other closely. As the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) states, both the mentor and PST may self-disclose during these talks. As a result, this may increase the level of liking and closeness between them, and thus they may participate in more disclosure. Gradually, this reciprocal exchange of self-disclosures graduates from non-intimate to intimate stages. On the other hand, the mentors and PSTs exchange of disclosures that include sharing of knowledge, experiences, concerns, and feedback may motivate, enculturate the PSTs into teaching, allow the PSTs to work side by side with the mentors to learn all the aspects related to teaching, and ultimately improve PSTs' learning to teach.

Studying the processes of mentoring relationship from both the mentor's and PST's sides has become the focus of mentoring literature (Dougherty & Dreher, 2007; Fletcher & Ragins, 2007; Wanberg, Welsh, & Hezlett, 2003); therefore, this study will add to the mentoring literature in three different ways. First, this study will add to the research of self-disclosure in the

mentoring relationships and PSTs' learning to teach. Second, it will develop a theoretical understanding of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience. Third, this study will shed light on the further investigation of research and theoretical framework of self-disclosure in the field of teacher education.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

Chapter Three presents an overview of the selected methodology for this dissertation. The chapter starts by providing a rationale of the study, a rationale of the selected methods and design, the purpose of the study followed by research questions, human subject, and study participants and site. The second section presents the data sources (semi-structured interviews, direct observation, and focus group interview), data collection, and data analysis. The final section discusses the privacy and confidentiality of the participants, potential limitations of the research design, connection to theory and methodology, and a summary that concludes the chapter.

Research Design

Considering the small body of research and the need for empirical studies on the mentor-mentee communication in the field experience (Noe, Greenberger, & Wang, 2002; Wanberg, Welsh & Hezlett, 2003), this study examined the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the development of mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience. In order to obtain answers to the research questions, it was necessary to consider an appropriate research design. As the goal of this study was to “determine the essence of a single phenomenon” (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2010), a qualitative, multiple case study approach was used to design the study and answer the research questions. Creswell (1998) defined case study approach as “a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a case or multiple cases over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, and interviews), and reports a case description and case-based themes” (p.73). Yin (2003) suggested that case study approach should be implemented if the emphasis of

the study is to answer “how” and “why” questions or to cover contextual conditions that are applicable to the phenomenon in the study (Baxter & Jack, 2008). According to Benbasat (1987), case study approach has multiple benefits including, recording the knowledge of practitioners, developing theories from the application, and progressing to the testing phase. Furthermore, this approach is advantageous in the primary phases of research where little is known about the topic (Babbie, 2001). According to Yin (2003), multiple case study approach includes the analysis and mixture of the patterns, similarities and dissimilarities across two or more cases that involve a mutual target or emphasis. This approach provides more support to the conclusions in the study than does a single case. Bromley (1990) defined multiple case studies as “systematic inquiry into an event or a set of related events which aims to describe and explain the phenomenon of interest” (p. 302). Accordingly, the unit of analysis in multiple case studies may differ from an individual person or group of people to a location or individuals in a location. In this study, the unit of analysis was set based on each mentor teacher and his/ her student teachers.

This study was conducted throughout three phases. First, at the beginning of the academic semester, each pair of a mentor and PST in the two cases was observed once while discussing the Collaborative Assessment Log (CAL) to target the exchange of verbal and non-verbal types of disclosure, including gestures, facial and body language, and other types of non-verbal communication. Then, a semi-structured interview was conducted with each participant to explore their perception of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in field experience. Once I analyzed the first set of data from the interviews, I modified my interview questions to further obtain comprehensive data and fill aroused gaps. Second, in the middle of the semester, another semi-structured interview was conducted with each PST to explore any development in the mentoring relationship and PSTs’ learning to teach. The findings were further confirmed by

interviewing each mentor teacher. Third, the last set of individual interviews was conducted with the mentors and preservice teachers at the end of the semester to explore any development in the mentoring relationship and PSTs' learning to teach. To confirm my findings, I conducted two focus group interviews, one with the mentors and another with PSTs so that each party can separately discuss their perception of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in field experience, and its effects on mentoring relationship development and PSTs' learning to teach.

Validity, trustworthiness and objectivity are major concerns for the data collection and analysis in multiple case studies; therefore, they should be clarified during the design phase (Kohn, 1997). First, validity of data collection was established by collecting data through different phases and via triangulate sources (e.g. semi-structured interviews, direct observation, and focus group interview). Second, validity of data analysis was established by using replication methods to analyze the collected data (Yin, 1994). Lastly, objectivity was ensured by restricting partiality and early judgments, and remaining unbiased in verbal and non-verbal responses during the individual and focus group interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Research Questions

- 1- What are the topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience?
- 2- What are the factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience?
- 3- How do mentors and preservice teachers use self-disclosure as a tool to enhance the mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach?

The Study Site

The field placement office in teacher education program places preservice teachers at the best school sites that adopt the university's concepts and comply with the prerequisites of the

teacher education program (Field Experience Handbook, 2014-2015). In order to assure having a fruitful teaching experience with very experienced mentors, the field placement office works hard to recognize schools with linguistic and diverse classrooms to enrich the students' learning experiences and ensure their success as future teachers.

The selected school for this study is located in the south-west of United States, and consists of 2500 students and 110 faculty members. The demographical composition of the school is 39% Caucasian, 35.5% Hispanic, 16% African-American, and 9.5% Asian/Pacific Islander. The school currently has five mentor teachers in different content areas and five preservice teachers. Since 2007, the high school has been maintaining a partnership with the university to provide the teacher candidates and student teachers with a chance to work side by side with the mentor teachers during a two-semester field experience. In addition, the high school allows the teacher candidates and student teachers to teach under the direction and supervision of the mentor teachers in classrooms. During the field experience, the mentors supervise, correct and provide the teacher candidates and the student teachers with feedback to learn the dispositions and skills necessary to become effective and reflective practitioners (Field Experience Handbook, 2014-2015).

Participants

Johnson (1990) argued that research participants should be recruited on the "basis of their attributes, such as access to certain kinds of information or knowledge" (p.10). Two mentors and three preservice teachers from an urban high school participated in this study. Each mentor and preservice teacher participated in one observation session, three sets of semi-structured interviews, and one focus group interview to understand their perception of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure and its effects on the mentoring relationships development and PSTs' learning to

teach. The ethnic group, gender and subject area of the mentor participants included a Caucasian male and female who taught World History at Social Studies department. On the other hand, the ethnic group, gender and program of study of the PST participants included a Caucasian male and an African-American female who are enrolled in Alternative Route to Licensure – Graduate Licensure Program (ARL-GLP), and a practicum II Hispanic male student. This "theoretical sampling" (Johnson, 1990, p. 38) will guide the research and highlight the significance of theoretical framework.

Case one included one mentor and two preservice teachers. Mr. Carlos was a Hispanic male preservice teacher, in his early twenties. He was working on his undergraduate degree in Education as a practicum II student. Although Mr. Carlos did not have a clear decision about what subject area he wanted to pursue, at the time of this study, he was assigned to teach the ninth and tenth grades under the supervision of a World History teacher at the Department of Social Studies. Furthermore, Mr. Carlos held random job positions at different companies before his decision to become a teacher. He was very enthusiastic about teaching.

Alice was an African-American female, in her early thirties. She held a Bachelor's degree in Business and Marketing and was enrolled in Alternative Route to Licensure – Graduate Licensure Program (ARL-GLP) at the time of the study. Alice had to work the night shift as a waitress in a restaurant to support her family, go to school in the morning to work on her (ARL-GLP) program, and take care of her two children and husband during the day. Furthermore, she lived very far from the school where she did her field experience. At the beginning of the semester, Alice was mentored at the English department, and then she was assigned to teach the ninth and tenth grades under the supervision and mentorship of Mr. Phillip at the Department of Social Studies.

Mr. Phillip was a Caucasian male mentor teacher, in his early sixties. He held a Bachelor's degree in History and a Master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction. Because of his experience in teaching and mentoring student teachers, Mr. Phillip was requested to transfer from middle school to his current high school. Before becoming a teacher, Mr. Phillip served in the military as a master sergeant. Although he had noticed his training skills and wanted to become a teacher as he stated "I really wanted to teach and inspire students," he did not become a teacher until the age of 40. Through his seven-year mentoring experience, Mr. Phillip had developed three mentoring philosophies: willingness to accept and expect mistakes, commitment to fidelity to develop practices and strategies, and knowing student teachers on individual bases.

Case 2 included a mentor and a preservice teacher. Gallardo was a Caucasian male preservice teacher, in his late thirties. He held a Bachelor's degree in Political Science and History and was enrolled in Alternative Route to Licensure – Graduate Licensure Program (ARL-GLP) at the time of the study. Besides English, Gallardo spoke Latin and Greece and was fond of Greek mythology and civilization. Gallardo had held different managerial positions before he decided to pursue a teaching career. However, at the time of the study, he worked in recording music at night and went to school during the day to work on her (ARL-GLP) program. Gallardo lived relatively close from the school site where he practiced teaching. Lastly, he was assigned to teach the ninth and tenth grades under the supervision of a World History teacher at the Department of Social Studies.

Ms. Kate was a Caucasian female mentor teacher, in her mid-forties. She held a Bachelor's degree in Political Science and History with a minor in Sociology and Psychology, and a Master's degree in Elementary Education. Because of her teaching experience, Ms. Kate was requested to transfer from middle school to her current high school. Besides her nine-year

teaching experience, Ms. Kate had two-year mentoring experience through which she developed her mentoring philosophy “student teachers’ total involvement.” Besides dedicatedly coaching the female soccer team at her school, Ms. Kate was an athlete who played soccer regularly. Moreover, she was a passionate mother of three children.

The two mentor teachers had good relationships with the school administration and other teachers, thus they were selected for this study based on the recommendations from the school administration. They had an average of ten-year teaching experience and five-year mentoring experience. In addition, they had participated in series of training provided by the College of Education faculty and worked directly with College of Education supervisors to tailor their mentoring skills to the precise needs of each student teacher. Furthermore, they had Certified Mentor Training Information that allowed them to develop reciprocal relationships with their assigned student teachers through a certain protocol for assessing teaching performance and addressing standards-based teaching practices (Field Experience Handbook, 2014-2015). They also met weekly with the site facilitators and the head of mentor teachers to discuss current and future plans.

Besides providing the student teachers with guidance and modeling which are vital to their understanding of the responsibilities of teaching, the mentor participants provided real life situations for the student teachers to implement methods course assignments. Further, their roles not only included coaching, facilitating, advocating, collaborating, problem solving and teaching but also as being information sources and trusted listeners.

On the other hand, the selection of the three PSTs for this study was associated with the selection of their mentor teachers. They were ARL-GLP, and Practicum II students who were enrolled in secondary field experience courses in fall 2015 and spring 2016. Additionally, the

PSTs considered the field experience a real internship and expected it to transfer them from student role to that of entry-level teacher, thus, they worked side by side with their mentor teachers and were available at school site at least twice a week.

The participants' willingness to spend time and effort was required to gather adequate data and answer the research questions. Therefore, each participant was asked to participate in one direct observation session, three semi-structured interviews, and one focus group interviews. Through a year's assistantship work at the school, I have developed a rapport with part of the participants, which gave me the opportunity to discuss and ask questions openly (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Although the study participants did not represent every mentor's or preservice teacher's perspective of self-disclosure, they offered a preliminary idea about the use of self-disclosure as a tool to improve the preservice teachers' learning to teach and to establish productive mentoring relationships in the field experience. In addition, they identified the topics, purposes and factors that influence exchanging disclosures between the mentors and PSTs in the field experiences.

Researcher Role

The researcher's role is a significant component of qualitative research (Creswell, 2012). It involves several tasks: designing the study, recruiting participants, and collecting, analyzing and interpreting data. Moreover, collecting data in qualitative research requires paying attention to the role a researcher may play (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). The researcher's cultural background, biases, experiences, and beliefs may influence the interpretation of the collected data.

During the doctoral program, as a researcher, I have participated in multiple projects, and I have accumulated first-hand experience in videotaping, recording, documenting, coding and

analyzing data. Additionally, I learned to restrict partiality and remain unbiased in verbal and non-verbal responses during interviews. Therefore, my role in this study involved a non-participant observer (Creswell, 2012).

Furthermore, I developed an understanding of the school context and culture, and built a rapport with the study participants, as a result of visiting the school site several times in the semester before conducting the study.

Table 2. The Study Participants

Pseudonym	Title	Gender	Ethnicity	Program	Courses	Subject Area
Carlos	PST	Male	Hispanic	Secondary undergraduate program	EDSC (408), EDSC (313)	
Alice	PST	Female	African American	ARL-GLP	CIS (602), CIS (603), CIS (604)	Social Studies
Gallardo	PST	Male	Caucasian	ARL-GLP		Social Studies
Mr. Phillip	Mentor	Male	Caucasian			World History
Ms. Kate	Mentor	Female	Caucasian			World History

Data Sources

Data was obtained from three observation sessions, three sets of semi-structured interviews, and two focus group interviews. Using multiple data sources will enhance the validity of the data (Miller, 2007; Yin, 2003).

Observation Protocol

In case study research, direct observation takes place when the researcher visits a site to observe the study participants without interfering or taking part in the study. Direct observation

prevents the observer from interfering in the participants' normal interaction; as a result, it contributes to the objectivity of the observed data (Drury, 1992). For this study, each pair of a mentor and PST was observed once at the beginning of the academic semester. Besides enabling me to develop an understanding of the topics and factors that influence the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in field experience, the observation sessions captured data unlikely to be captured from the semi-structured interviews or focus group interviews such as body language and other types of non-verbal communication. Furthermore, along with the semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews, the observation sessions guided the data analysis and contributed to answering the research questions. All observation sessions were conducted at the school site and utilized by using a video recorder. The observation protocol is provided in Appendix (C).

Semi-structured Interview Protocol

Each research participant was involved in three individual interviews; at the beginning, middle and end of the academic semester. The framework for the interviews was semi-structured (Merriam, 1998) and flexible, not limiting me to one type of questioning. Therefore, I utilized direct questions, open-ended questions, and a mixture of both. Lindlof and Taylor (2011) argue that this method involves structured questions; nonetheless, follow-up questions will emerge and will differ from one participant to another. Using semi-structure interviews enabled me to develop an understanding of the topics, purposes and factors that influence the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in field experience. Moreover, it enabled me "to enter into the other person's perspective" (Patton, 2002, p. 341) to understand the phenomenon (the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in field experience) from both the mentors' and PSTs' perspectives (Falk & Blumenreich, 2005).

Besides confirming the findings from the observation sessions, the semi-structured interviews guided the data analysis and contributed to answering the three research questions. Furthermore, to fully understand the participants' perspective of self-disclosure, the questions of the semi-structured interviews were likely modified during the time of the interviews. All interviews were conducted at the school site, and recorded by using a tape recorder. Also, all interviews were transcribed and returned to the study participants via email as they were requested to review the transcripts and email them back if they made any changes. This process allowed the participants to clarify their statements, and add to the trustworthiness of the interpretations of the data. The three protocols of mentors' semi-structured interviews are provided in Appendices (A¹, A², and A³). Meanwhile the three protocols of preservice teachers' semi-structured interviews are provided in Appendices (B¹, B², and B³).

Focus Group Interview Protocol

Interviews are the key sources of case study research. Nevertheless, interviews come in different forms: One of these forms is focus group interview. According to Thomas (1995), focus group interview is "a technique involving the use of in-depth group interviews in which participants are selected because they are a purposive, although not necessarily representative, sampling of a specific population, this group being 'focused' on a given topic" (p.75). Participants in focus group interviews are interviewed for a short time and selected based on their involvement in the study or their aptitude to talk to other participants and the interviewer (Richardson & Rabiee, 2001). Additionally, the social interaction of the group participants generates richer data than the ones gained from one-to-one interviews (Thomas, 1995). Along with the observation sessions and the semi-structured interviews, the focus group discussions guided the data analysis and contributed to answering the three research questions. The focus

group interviews were conducted at the school site, and utilized by using a voice recorder and field notes. To fully understand the participants' perspective of self-disclosure, follow-up questions emerged during the course of the interviews. The focus group interviews protocol is provided in Appendix (D).

Table 3. Connecting data sources with research questions.

Data Source	Research Questions
Observation	1-What are the topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience? 2-What are the factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience?
Direct Semi-structured Interview	1-What are the topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience? 2-What are the factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience? 3-How do mentors and preservice teachers use self-disclosure as a tool to enhance the mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach?
Focus Group Interview	1-What are the topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience? 2-What are the factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience? 3-How do mentors and preservice teachers use self-disclosure as a tool to enhance the mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach?

Data Collection

Phase 1: Beginning of School Semester

After obtaining the approval from IRB (see Appendix F), I met the study participants at the school site to clarify the purpose, rationale and procedure as well as the implications of the study. Prior to the observation sessions, the participants' voluntary participation in the study was reassured. They were informed that their participation or non-participation would not affect them and that withdrawal from the study would be approved immediately upon their request. In addition, they were assured that their identities would be protected. Furthermore, I had the

participants read the informed letter of consent and signed, if they agreed to participate in the study.

The three direct observation sessions took place at school site at the beginning of school semester. During each of the three sessions, I directed the video camera towards each pair (mentor and preservice teacher) while discussing the Collaborative Assessment Log. In fact, I intended to videotape and capture the interaction between each pair of a mentor and PST in a setting that was close to realia. Therefore, after I turned on the video camera, I purposefully left the room, so that each pair can indulge in a professional and personal disclosure. This process ensured the spontaneity and validity of this method of data collection (direct observation). Besides confirming the findings from the semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews, the observation sessions targeted the development in the mentoring relationships and PSTs' learning to teach that occurred by exchanging verbal and non-verbal disclosures including, body language and other types of non-verbal communication.

Moreover, each of the three PSTs was interviewed at the beginning of the school semester. Each semi-structured interview was around 20-25 minutes long, and was divided into two parts. The first part of the interview focused on the PSTs' personal disclosure, and included questions about biographical details, working experience, school setting, mentoring relationships, and topics and purposes of the information PSTs and mentors shared. The other part of the interview focused on the PSTs' professional disclosure, and included questions about mentors' teaching and mentoring experiences, topics and purposes of the information the PSTs and mentors shared, challenges PSTs face while teaching and dealing with their mentors, and the initiation of information sharing.

Likewise, each of the two mentors was interviewed at the beginning of the school semester. The semi-structured interview was around 20-25 minutes long, and was divided into two parts. The first part of the interview focused on the mentors' personal disclosure, and included questions about biographical details, working experience, school setting, mentoring relationships, and topics and purposes of the information mentors and PSTs shared. The other part of the interview focused on mentors' professional self-disclosure, and included questions about mentors' teaching and mentoring experiences, mentors' mentoring styles, topics and purposes of the information the PSTs and mentors shared, challenges PSTs face while teaching and dealing with their mentors, challenges mentors face while dealing with PSTs, and the initiation of information sharing.

Phase II: Middle of the School Semester

During this phase of data collection, each of the three PSTs was interviewed in the middle of the academic semester. Each semi-structured interview was around 20-25 minutes long, and divided into two parts. The first part of the interview focused on the PSTs' personal disclosure, and included questions about topics and purposes of the information PSTs and mentors shared, the characteristics of a functional mentoring relationship, characteristics of a successful mentor, the decision about whether to share or not, what impacts the communication level between the PST and mentor.

The other part of the interview focused on the PSTs' professional disclosure, and included questions about topics and purposes of the information PSTs shared with their mentors, challenges PSTs face while teaching and dealing with their mentor, and the extent to which mentors and PSTs feel comfortable sharing their professional information.

Similarly, each of the two mentors was interviewed in the middle of the school semester. The semi-structured interview was around 20-25 minutes long, and focused on the changes in mentors' perception of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience. Part of the interview focused on the mentors' personal self-disclosure, and included questions about topics and purposes of the information mentors shared with PSTs, the characteristics of a functional mentoring relationship, characteristics of a successful mentor, the decision whether to share or not, what impacts the communication level between the PST and mentor. The other part of the interview focused on the mentors' professional disclosure, and included questions about topics and purposes of the information mentors shared with PSTs, challenges PSTs face while teaching and dealing with their mentor, the extent to which mentors and PSTs feel comfortable sharing their professional information, and the changes in the mentors' teaching and mentoring styles.

Phase III: End of the School Semester

During this phase, each of the three PSTs was interviewed at the end of the academic semester. Each semi-structured interview was around 15-20 minutes long, and was divided into two parts. The first part focused on the PSTs' personal disclosure, and included questions about the development in the mentor-mentee relationship, characteristics of a functional mentoring relationship and characteristics of a successful mentor, what impacts mentoring relationship building and the extent to which mentors and PSTs feel comfortable sharing their personal information in the field experience. The other part of the interview focused on the PSTs' professional disclosure, and included questions about the influence of information sharing on PSTs' learning to teach during this field experience, the influence of information sharing on PSTs' success in their teaching career, the use of information sharing in learning.

Additionally, each of the two mentors was interviewed at the end of the school semester. The semi-structured interview was around 15-20 minutes long, and focused on mentors' understanding of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience. Part of the interview focused on the mentors' self-disclosure of their personal information, and included questions about the development in the mentor-mentee relationship, characteristics of a functional mentoring relationship, characteristics of a successful mentor, what impacts mentoring relationship building and the extent to which mentors and PSTs feel comfortable sharing their personal information in the field experience. The other part of the interview focused on the mentors' self-disclosure of their professional information, and included questions about the influence of information sharing on PSTs' learning to teach during this field experience, the influence of information sharing on PSTs' success in their teaching career, the use of information sharing as a teachable moment, the use of information sharing in explaining PSTs' assignments and providing advice, examples and strategies during the field experience

Furthermore, the two focus group interviews were conducted at the end of the academic semester after I conducted and analyzed the data from the three sets of semi-structured interviews and the three sessions of direct observations. First, the three PSTs were interviewed collectively and asked about their perception of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure and its effects on the field experience. Next, another focus group interview was conducted with the two mentors in which they were asked about their perception of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure and its effects on the field experience. Each participant in the two interviews identified himself/ herself when addressed with a question to ensure a precise transcription of the data. In fact, data obtained from the focus group interviews was used as a confirmation or addition to the data obtained from other data sources. Additionally, the social interaction between the group

participants generated richer data than the ones gained from one-to-one interviews (Thomas, 1995).

The validity of data collection was established by collecting the data during different phases and via triangulate sources (direct observation, semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews).

Data Analysis

Strauss and Corbin (1998) pictured data analysis as “the interplay between researchers and data”. Nevertheless, case study research approach creates an enormous amount of data from interviews and other data sources; which causes researchers a challenge (Lester, 1999). The time and effort invested in interviewing and building relationships with the study participants facilitated the process of data analysis, which according to Lindlof and Taylor (2002) was considered one of the major assets of qualitative research. While the recorded conversations from the three data sources was the basis of data analysis, capturing and considering the participants’ body language might change the dimension of the data analysis. Since this study included data from two mentors and three PSTs (multiple cases), the analytic method to be used was replication. Replication is a method of triangulation that aims at examining the relationships among the findings within a case first, and then compares the patterns and similarities across the cases, looking for similarities and patterns. If similarities are not found among the multiple cases, the researcher has to reexamine his/ her initial themes. On the other hand, if similarities are found among the cases, literal replication will be attained. Meanwhile, if similarities are not found among cases, but for anticipated causes, theoretical replication will be attained (Yin, 1994).

Data analysis for the present study was conducted throughout three phases. First, I started a within-case analysis for every interview or observation session by using open coding method. Open coding method was used to primarily organize and construct the categories (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). This process provided a full picture of each case and themes within the case. Second, I reviewed and compared the data from each pair (mentor and mentee). Comparing data from the both participants of each pair of mentor and PST allowed me to identify similarities, and clarify potential assumptions. Additionally, it added to the trustworthiness of the interpretations of the participants' perceptions of the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience (Patton, 2002; Stake, 2005). Third, I conducted a cross-case analysis to identify patterns, similarities or dissimilarities among the cases. This process was achieved by reading the transcripts multiple times to better understand the collected data, and identify the issues and themes that arose within all the transcriptions (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002).

Human Subject

To ensure the ethical conduct and safety of the study participants, a request was submitted to the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) of the local university. Once the written notification of the approval of the study by the university IRB had been received, the participants received an informed letter of consent and were given time to ask questions regarding the study and the collection of data. The participants were contacted through phone calls and emails and were asked for their agreement to participate in this study.

The consenting process took place at the school site, outside teachers' contract hours. The voluntary participation was emphasized before I conducted the data collection. They were informed that their participation or non-participation would not affect them and that withdrawal from the study would be approved immediately upon their request. Another part of the

consenting process occurred before the interview with the mentors and PSTs; I had the participants read the informed letter of consent and signed when they agreed to participate in the study.

Privacy and Confidentiality

Neither the names of the mentors and preservice teachers nor the name of the school appeared on any page of the research. Pseudonyms were used to refer to the mentor teachers, preservice teachers, and school names.

Connection to Theory and Methodology

The selected theoretical framework for this study best explored all aspects of its research questions, and guided its data collection and data analysis. See Appendices (A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³, C and D). The key concepts of social penetration theory and social exchange theory concerned the social aspects of learning (Wilson & Peterson, 2006), and explored the role self-disclosure played in the mentor-mentee relationship development and the PSTs' learning to teach in the field experiences. All of these key concepts had been clarified in the earlier chapters and were used to analyze the data, and consequently created conclusions in the coming chapters.

The discussion on the theories and the literature review of teacher education showed a lack of empirical studies related to the mentor-mentee communication in the field experience, specifically the effects of self-disclosure on the mentoring relationships development and PSTs' learning to teach. Therefore, there was a necessity for research that examined how the mentors and preservice teacher utilized self-disclosure in the field experiences. These gaps had been discussed and explored, and were used in the coming chapters of this study in an effort to be filled.

Summary

This multiple-case study examined the role mentor-mentee self-disclosure played in mentoring relationship development and PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience. The participants were two mentors and three PSTs from a suburban high school in the southwestern United States. The participants were requested to participate in individual interviews, a focus group interview, and to be observed. The qualitative data was collected from multiple data sources, and analyzed using the replication method described by Yin (1994).

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Chapter Four presents the findings of the current study. The findings in this chapter are reported in two ways, including a description of participants, themes and sub-themes emerged from the data analysis of each case study separately, and a comparison of the findings from all cases collectively. This chapter is dedicated to answering the research questions by describing the major findings in three aspects: first, topics and purposes of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience are explained; second, factors that influence the social exchange of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience; and third, impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience.

Creswell (2008) described the qualitative research as,

A type of educational research in which the researcher relies on the user participants, asks broad, general questions, collects data consisting largely of words or text from participants, describes and analyzes these words for themes, and conducts the inquiry in a subjective, biased manner (p. 46).

In order to understand the phenomenon of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure and its use in the field experience, the researcher in this study attempted to answer the following research questions:

- 1- What are the topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience?
- 2- What are the factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience?

- 3- How do mentors and preservice teachers use self-disclosure as a tool to enhance the mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach?

This multiple case study examined the mentor-mentee self-disclosure as an approach to informal communication and its effects on the mentoring relationships, and preservice teachers' learning to teach during the field experience. The study site was selected because the high school has been maintaining a partnership with the university since 2007 to provide the teacher candidates and student teachers with chances to work side by side with the mentor teachers during a two-semester field experience. The selection of the two mentors for this study was based on recommendations from the school administration; meanwhile, the selection of the three PSTs was associated with the selection of their mentor teachers. Case 1 involved one mentor and two preservice teachers, and Case 2 involved one mentor and one preservice teacher. Case 1 included a Caucasian male mentor, Hispanic male and African-American female preservice teachers. Case 2 included a Caucasian female mentor teacher and a Caucasian male preservice teacher. This "theoretical sampling" (Johnson, 1990, p. 38) will guide the research and highlight the significance of theoretical framework.

Data for this qualitative study was collected through three phases and through multiple sources (direct observations, individual and group interviews). Moreover, data analysis was conducted through two phases and utilized by the replication method. Replication is a method of triangulation that aims at examining the relationships among the findings within a case first, and then compares the patterns and similarities across the cases, looking for similarities and patterns. If similarities are not found among the multiple cases, the researcher has to reexamine his/ her initial themes. On the other hand, if similarities are found among the cases, literal replication will

be attained. Meanwhile, if similarities are not found among cases, but for anticipated causes, theoretical replication will be attained (Yin, 1994).

The findings in the current were reported based on the three themes that are related to research questions: topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, and impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience. Each of the research questions was answered by using the qualitative data gathered from the observation sessions, individual interviews and focus group interviews in two case studies. The following sections examine each theme in the order above with consideration to the sub-themes that emerged throughout data analysis.

Case Study 1 Carlos, Alice and Mr. Phillip

Topics and Purposes of Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

Although I believe that the topics, purposes and factors that influence the social exchange of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience should be discussed collectively, I am attempting to discuss the topics and purposes of exchanging SD in this section, and postponing the factors that influence such sharing of information to discuss in the sections that follow. Data from three sets of individual interviews and one group interview with the participants in Case 1 contributed to this theme. Direct observation and conversation with both participants, on the other hand, supported the emergence of its sub-themes. Carlos and Alice (PSTs) and Mr. Phillip (mentor) exchanged personal and professional information during the field experience. This exchange of information was intended differently from the participants. The observation session targeted information sharing that occurred verbally and non-verbally including, body language

and other types of non-verbal communication. Meanwhile, interview questions for the PSTs and mentor included biographical details, working experience, mentors' teaching and mentoring experiences, school setting, mentoring relationship, topics and purposes of the information the participants shared in the field experience (see appendices A1, A2, A3, B1, B2, B3, C and D). The following table displays the sub-themes of topics of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience.

Table 4. Sub-Themes of Topics of Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience in Case 1.

Personal Self-Disclosure	Professional Self-Disclosure	
	Teaching Struggles	
Family, religion, working experience, childhood, cultural and historical facts, and personal problems	Content & Pedagogy	Career development

Personal Topics of Self-Disclosure

Data from observation and individual interviews revealed that Carols and Alice (PSTs) and Mr. Phillip (mentor) exchanged personal information about family, religion, working experience, childhood, cultural and historical facts, and personal problems during the field experience. This sharing of information was intended differently from each one of them. For instance, data revealed that Carlos and Alice shared their personal information to relate to Mr. Phillip and students, and ask for advice or opinions. On the other hand, data revealed that Mr. Phillip shared his personal information to allow Carlos and Alice to approach him, understand their personalities, establish a rapport with them, and create a safe and comfortable learning environment for them.

Data from observation revealed that Carlos and Mr. Phillip exchanged personal information before they discussed the Collaborative Assessment Log. Below is an example:

Mr. Phillip: Hello Carlos. How was your weekend?

Carlos: I had a good weekend....I met some family members at the local church, and we had brunch together. How about yours?

Mr. Phillip: I had a relatively good weekend as well. We visited some friends on Saturday, and I watched a movie at home with my wife on Sunday.

Mr. Phillip: How did your girlfriend do with the job interview?

Carlos: Well, she came home happily. I hope she gets the job.

Likewise, data from observation revealed that Alice and Mr. Phillip exchanged personal information before they discussed the Collaborative Assessment Log.

Mr. Phillip: Good morning....How was weekend? Have you caught some sleep?

Alice: Good morning. I had a busy weekend; one of the twins had a fever, so I had to take him to the doctor, and I worked at the restaurant. What about yours?

Mr. Phillip: I'm sorry to hear that. My weekend wasn't bad...we had visitors and we watched some TV shows.

Alice: I'm glad your weekend was better than mine.

When asked Carlos what type of talks or information he usually exchanged with his mentor, Carlos responded: *"We share some personal information that he knows I'm comfortable talking about like family, working experience and childhood"* (first interview). Alice remarked that not reciprocating and exchanging personal information at workplace *"would be weird."* As a result, she reported sharing personal information and stories with Mr. Phillip: *"I tell him about my childhood, hobbies, family, and kids and vice versa. He also tells me about his wife, so we do know about each other"* (first interview).

Carlos and Alice believed that the ultimate purpose for such sharing was to build a rapport with their mentor. For example, Carlos stated:

My mentor shared information about his wife, funny stories about the time when he served in the military; how he never had any sleep and even stories about his youth and how he grew up in poverty and used to be a rebellious kid. I do like that because my last mentor teacher never opened up to me at all.

Carlos and Alice also reported sharing information and stories about religion and cultural and historical facts to build a rapport with their mentor, and relate to their students. For example, Alice mentioned: *“We do talk about historical facts because I’m business major, so I need to hear about all historical stories. We also talk about politics and religion; he always has something to say to or a good response”* (second interview).

Moreover, Carlos and Alice revealed that sharing his personal problems allowed them to explain their situations, and receive advice and suggestions. Carlos remarked:

When I open up to him, he does too. He usually has something to say to me whenever I share something. If I have a personal problem, he usually shares a story through which he provides advice or suggestion (third interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip strongly believed that *“The progress of the field experience is relationship driven.”* As a result, he focused during the first interview on the importance of exchanging personal information with his student teachers (STs) to establish a rapport and connect: *“I know about Alice’s family and husband. I know where she lives. I know what kind of car she drives and what she does for a living.”* Mr. Phillip also specified that sharing personal information should not have a formal structure and should occur spontaneously during breaks and preparation times to take advantage of the opportunity, and build a rapport

with the STs: *“We talk about neutral subjects like you start talking about religion or some other members of the department, and you have laughter”* (second interview). He also mentioned: *“We don’t share personal details...we know a little about each other....very broadly general information...not specific.”*

Furthermore, Mr. Phillip revealed that sharing some personal issues with Carlos and Alice allowed him to understand their personalities: *“We are aware of each other’s personal issues,”* and helped him predict how things would go in the classroom:

If they don’t have problems at home, they will not be bringing drama in the classroom.

But if I’m dealing with someone with a problem then I can expect problems or higher absentees or sickness. If I know the person, it will help me know how he is going to act in the classroom (third interview).

Professional Topics of Self-Disclosure

Data from observation and individual and group interviews revealed that Carlos and Alice (PSTs) and Mr. Phillip (mentor) exchanged professional information about teaching struggles with content and pedagogical knowledge, and career development. This sharing of information was intended differently from the participants. For instance, data revealed that Carlos and Alice shared their professional information with Mr. Phillip to ask for helpful strategies and insights, explain their struggles, relieve stress and anxiety, and understand the reality of teaching. On the other hand, data revealed that Mr. Phillip shared his professional information to provide Carlos and Alice with feedback, advice, and examples to make them feel safe and comfortable when they made mistakes.

Teaching Struggles

During the first interview with Carlos and Alice, the term “teaching struggles” was repeated several times. After further investigation, I eventually categorized their “teaching struggles” into struggles with content and pedagogy and career development.

Struggles with Content and Pedagogy

Throughout the observation sessions and interviews with the participants in Case 1, the term “content and pedagogy” was directly mentioned. For example, during one observation session, Mr. Phillip shared some professional information through which he provided Carlos with feedback about his content and pedagogical knowledge in the classroom.

Mr. Phillip: I have noticed that your lesson planning was not holistic, and that you struggled with some historical facts; as a result, you could not answer some of the students' questions regarding the content. Also, you have to work on your classroom management skills.

Carlos: I know, but History is not my major.

Mr. Phillip: Listen! An engaged student is unlikely to be off task; at worst he/she would be a compliant student. So, stop worrying about classroom management and worry about developing those engaging lessons and using sound and effective strategies and chunking your lessons.

Mr. Phillip: When I started teaching, although History was my major, I used to get the text book and familiarize myself with it. You don't have to be a content master of all contents.

In the first interview when asked what teaching-related information he shared with his mentor, Carlos reported sharing his weaknesses in content and pedagogy to receive advice, and improve his teaching skills: “I always talk to him about my struggles with some historical facts

and terms, lesson planning, and classroom management.” Likewise, Alice revealed that the roots of her weaknesses in content and pedagogical knowledge lied in her major: *“I always tell him about my struggles with classroom management. Since I don’t have a history major, I would like to hear about his professional experience regarding the content and classroom management”* (first interview). Carlos and Alice believed that expressing their struggles with content and pedagogy not only allowed Mr. Phillip to recognize their struggles but also provided them with strategies and insights to overcome such struggles. For example, Alice stated: *One of his solutions was to leave me in the classroom by myself because students were not taking me seriously*” (second interview). Moreover, Carlos claimed: *“I learn from expressing my struggles and what follows from mentors’ feedback, guidance, and shared experience”* (group interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip remarked that Carlos and Alice should not have content and pedagogy-related struggles because he was always available in the classroom with them. However, he shared his professional experiences and struggles with content to provide them with feedback, advice, and examples. For instance, Mr. Phillip reported that when Carlos shared his struggles defining certain historical facts in front of the students, Mr. Phillip shared his experience with Spanish vocabularies to illustrate a point or provide Carlos with an example: *“The reason I share the story academically is to encourage him to know his lesson before he teaches it especially dealing with ELL kids and to make sure you know the right word”* (first interview).

Mr. Phillip also argued that Social Studies was a very broad discipline and that PSTs’ knowledge might vary; therefore, he reported sharing his first year teaching experience with Carlos and Alice to provide them with strategies: *“I used to pretend knowing it all, sometimes. No matter how little you know about World History, you know more than your kids do. So,*

pretend that you know it, till you know it.” Moreover Mr. Phillip highlighted the importance of pushing his STs to go off the book and try something creative to ignite the students’ passion for knowledge, saying:

You don’t have to be expert to figure this out because the secret to deliver the content to the kids is to make kids excited and want to explore certain areas that you may not be a master of, but they can be (second interview).

Furthermore, Mr. Phillip reported that Carlos and Alice demonstrated insufficient pedagogical knowledge and skills in the classroom. Therefore, he shared information and experiences related to pedagogy with them to ensure the proper and effective application of pedagogical knowledge in the classroom:

I tell them that the key to having successful classroom management is to create engaging lessons. The other thing I share with them is my classroom rules because I want them to think and come up with their own rules, and I tell them that classroom rules become the procedure of how you want things to go in the classroom (third interview).

Career Development

Throughout the interviews with the research participants in Case 1, the term “career development” was implied. For instance, Alice revealed that sharing her concerns, questions or confusions about instructional processes with Mr. Phillip gave her insights and ideas about her performance: *“When I need to vent or when I have concerns, questions, confusions or issues, I need a knowledgeable or experienced person to talk to in order to give me insights on what to do in such situations”* (first interview). Also, Carlos and Alice reported that sharing concerns and questions related to the instructional process helped them relieve stress and anxiety. For example, Carlos mentioned that his mentor told him before the beginning of the semester

“Listen, you are going to make plenty of mistakes but don’t worry because this is a learning process and everything you will go through; every teacher has gone through it, so relax and be yourself” (first interview). Moreover, Carlos and Alice revealed that sharing concerns and questions with Mr. Phillip helped them understand the reality of teaching. Alice stated:

We talk about politics within the school and school district. Such things I would never know. This stuff he told me I think will prepare me for the real life of teachers. I mean how things are not perfect now but manageable. He wants to make me feel comfortable and open up as he is preparing me to succeed in my teaching career (second interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip related to his ST’s concerns and questions to relieve their stress and anxiety: *“I facilitate learning experiences in the classroom, but if they need support, I will give a swift kick in the butt to do that, and I will provide a shoulder to cry on if they need that”* (first interview). Additionally, Mr. Phillip noted that successful mentors should relate to STs’ concerns and questions to prepare them to understand the reality of teaching. As a result, he shared his job search experiences with Carlos and Alice:

Administrators are not looking for lecturers. They are looking for teachers who can prepare meaningful and engaging lessons and can take care of classroom management. I learned to interview the person who interviewed me when I applied for teaching jobs. I also learned that as an interviewee you are entitled to ask questions about the school. I also share the questions I was asked when I was interviewed for a teaching position. For example, your leadership philosophy or style, if you are interested in maintaining where you are at in test scores or moving ahead? (Second interview)

Furthermore, Mr. Phillip reflected on his professional experience and provided Carlos and Alice with advice and strategies to ensure their success as future teachers: *“I told Carlos and*

Alice that in order to master a craft it takes time and experience, and you cannot rush either one” (third interview). He also mentioned in the group interview:

We expose our STs to the reality of teaching, and this is a tough school to teach in because of the demographic and the academic challenges we have. They know if they can teach here they can teach at any school in CCSD. I also told my STs before you are interviewed you have to go to school web site and learn about school demographics because you have to know the school population before you walk into the door, and you are going to find it somehow similar to our school, and then you can apply that up in the interview.

Data from one observation session, three individual interviews and one focus group interview revealed that the parties in the Case 1 self-disclosed information about personal and professional topics during the field experience. The topics of personal disclosure included information about family, religion, working experience, childhood, cultural and historical facts, and personal problems. This exchange of personal disclosure was attached to certain purposes. For example, the PSTs self-disclosed personal information to build relationship with their mentor teacher, relate to their students, receive advice, and understand the reality of teaching. Similarly, the mentor self-disclosed personal information to build a rapport with the PSTs, understand the PSTs’ personalities, and predict how things would go in the classroom as well as become approachable.

On the other hand, the topics of professional disclosure included information about struggles with content and pedagogy, and career development. Whereas the PSTs in Case 1 disclosed their weaknesses in content and pedagogical knowledge to their mentor teacher to receive suggestions, advice, and improve their teaching skills, their mentor shared their

professional experiences and teaching struggles to give the PSTs feedback, advice, and examples. Moreover, while the PSTs self-disclosed their concerns and questions about career development to relieve stress and anxiety, and understand the reality of teaching, the mentor related to his PSTs' concerns, questions or confusions to relieve their stress and anxiety as well. The topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure contribute to answering research question one.

Factors that Influence Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

Data for this theme primarily appeared from three sets of individual interviews and one group interview with the participants in Case 1. Direct observation with the participants contributed to emergence of its sub-themes. The PSTs and mentor exchanged personal and professional information during the field experience. This exchange of information was influenced by personal attributes, mentoring philosophy, and student teacher's need. Interviews' questions for both the PSTs and mentors included information about the characteristics of functional mentoring relationship, characteristics of successful mentors, the decision to share or not share information with the mentor teacher/ PST, challenges PSTs face while teaching and dealing with their mentor, challenges mentors face while dealing with PSTs, the initiation of information sharing, the factors that impact the communication level between the PST and mentor, and the extent to which mentors and PSTs feel comfortable sharing their personal or professional information (see Appendices A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³, and D). Table 2 displays the sub-themes of factors that influence the participants' self-disclosure in Case 1.

Table 5. Sub-Themes of Factors that Influence Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in Case 1.

Case 1	Mr. Phillip and Carlos	Mr. Phillip and Alice
Personal Attributes	X	X
Mentoring Philosophy	X	X
Student Teacher's Need	X	

Personal Attributes

Throughout the observation session and interviews with the participants in Case 1, the term “personal attributes” was implied. For example, data from observation showed that Mr. Phillip and Carlos were sitting relatively close to each other in a direct body orientation position. While talking about his wife’s health situation, Mr. Phillip expressed his emotions facially and vocally and so did Carlos while listening and sympathizing with him. Moreover, while discussing the Collaborative Assessment Log, Mr. Phillip smiled few times, and told Carlos in non-threatening language: *“You need to show confidence when you stand before the students... The beginning is hard but every teacher goes through it...I went through it.”* Moreover, both participants exchanged gestures and eye contacts; nonetheless, Mr. Phillip exchanged more eye contact and less gesture while listening to Carlos and less eye contact and more gesture while talking to him. On the other hand, Carlos used nonverbal responses and agreeing gestures and avoided eye contact while talking and listening to Mr. Phillip.

When asked about the characteristics mentors should have, Alice reported that Mr. Phillip demonstrated plausible personal attributes (e.g. easy to talk to, chatty, open and understandable) to encourage Alice to open up and share her personal and professional information, and ultimately support her learning to teach:

I have to feel comfortable in order to share information. He makes me comfortable because he is easy to talk to and open to me, and he relates to me and shares his

information with me, which makes me look at him in a different way than if he was a weird stranger (first interview).

Moreover, Carlos and Alice reported that Mr. Phillip's welcoming personality and sense of humor allowed them to share their information comfortably and obtain the assistance they needed during the field experience. Carlos noted: *"He makes me feel comfortable sharing stuff with him whether it was because he is cool and lenient, and he cares about me. Besides, he never shut me down whenever I opened up to him"* (second interview). Also, Alice mentioned: *"He has a sense of humor. He also wants me to feel comfortable which is normal when you work at a new place you feel stressed, and your manager tries to comfort you and make you welcomed"* (second interview). Furthermore, Carlos reported that Mr. Phillip listened to his ideas and considered his opinion (e.g. being a good listener and has a welcoming personality):

Well, he is a good listener whether it was to me or any other student in his class. I also take his class on Wednesday at the local university. Anyone can go to him after class and can share something with him or ask his opinion about personal issues or stuff related to teaching. In addition to his welcoming personality, he is ready to listen all the time (third interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip noted that individual characteristics such as (e.g. be open, modest and confident, and have a sense of humor) pave the way for information sharing, and mentoring relationship building in the field experience:

You have to welcome them in your classroom in order to share their concerns and ask questions. You should also have a sense of humor. When you come to the classroom, don't come to the room with an ego. Be modest and confident. It is OK if you admit to your mentee that you screw up sometimes (first interview).

Mentoring Philosophy

Throughout the observation session and interviews with the participants in Case 1, the term “mentoring philosophy” was cited repeatedly. For example, when asked to answer the question “*Who initiated information sharing at the beginning of his field experience?*” Carlos responded: “*My mentor did. He sensed my confusion, and then he smiled and broke the ice*” (first interview). Moreover, when asked to answer the question “*What motivated you to share information with your mentor?*” Alice replied:

It is his style or way of doing things; he doesn’t stress out over little things which started to reflect on me. Also, the way he communicates with me as a mentor reflects his laidback personality, which makes me relax and feel comfortable. When he responds to me, it is always something light and fluffy with the information I asked about. So it is not super stressful or full of pressure (first interview).

Additionally, Carlos and Alice reported being hesitant to share some personal or teaching-related issues with Mr. Phillip at the beginning of the field experience because of his situation at home. Carlos stated: “*I only hesitate to share my experiences in days when he came to school very sad about his wife’s health situation*” (second interview). Nevertheless, like Carlos, knowing Mr. Phillip’s mentoring philosophy allowed Alice to feel comfortable sharing information about her personal or professional life with him: “*The first week was rough because I didn’t understand him. He was not taking me seriously because I switched but once we started talking and sharing experiences, he got to know me*” (third interview). Furthermore, Carlos mentioned that his mentor gave him freedom and allowed him to become creative in the classroom:

When it comes to his mentoring style, he is very open, and he gives a lot of time to do what I need to do in the classroom. He also wants the students to be self-centered and able to do things in the classroom (third interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip focused on the importance of sharing personal information to build a rapport with his STs during the field experience. Nevertheless, he believed that sharing personal information should not have a formal structure and it should occur spontaneously during breaks and preparation times:

My STs never came to me and said we want to share our personal information. This comes in a casual way. Usually, five or ten minutes before class starts in the morning, I say let's go and get a cup of coffee, or you want to walk outside or go out smoke a cigarette? (first interview).

Furthermore, Mr. Phillip reported that this sharing of information or personal conversation was usually intended to take advantage of the opportunity, and it started from general to specific based on the relational stage between him and his STs. For instance, *"You talk about neutral subject...like you start talking about sports or some other members of the department, and you have laughter"*. However, Mr. Phillip initiated information sharing with Carlos and Alice because he believed that PSTs did not understand the nature of the relationship with their mentors at the beginning of the field experience:

The beginning has to be an intimidating moment for them. They don't know anything about the mentor or the mentor's personality and background. So, somebody has to break the ice and in that case, the mentor has to be the one who breaks the ice and shakes hand and says Hi! I'm Mr. Phillip. Welcome aboard.

Nonetheless, Mr. Phillip noted that sharing personal information wisely and not wasting STs' time with nonsensical stories was part of his mentoring philosophy: *"I share personal information very selectively to achieve a certain goal. My STs know superficial stuff about me, but they don't know me well, and that's by design"* (second interview). He also said: *"I don't tell stories for the sake of telling them. I tell stories for a specific end in my mind."*

Moreover, Mr. Phillip reported that his mentoring philosophy influenced the level of communication with his STs and supported their learning to teach: *"I don't want them to be the teachers they don't want to be in front of the classroom. I also want them to take chances and if it fails, it fails"* (third interview). Also, when asked about his mentoring philosophy, Mr. Phillip reported three mentoring philosophies including, willingness to accept and expect mistakes, commitment to fidelity to develop practices and strategies, and knowing the PSTs on individual bases:

One of my mentoring philosophies is that I expect my STs to make mistakes because mistakes are indicative of doing something or trying something new. Another philosophy I bring into mentoring is what I call fidelity. The first time you try something new, the results are not going to be optimal but there's a learning curve involved for the mentor and ST, and once you accept that, you start shopping for solutions. The third philosophy is getting to know the person you are dealing with on individual bases.

Student Teacher's Need

Throughout the observation session and interviews with the participants in Case 1, the term "student teacher's need" was indicated. For example, when asked to answer the question *"What made you share your information with Mr. Phillip?"* Carlos reported sharing his personal issues with Mr. Phillip purposefully to receive advice, examples or suggestions: *"When I open*

up to him, he does too. He usually has something to say to me; if I have a personal problem, he usually shares a story through which he provides advice or suggestion” (first interview). Carlos also reported that Mr. Phillip related to Carlos’ teaching struggles and concerns by sharing his professional experiences:

Besides sharing ways to create an engaging lesson planning, my mentor is open and ready to talk about anything has to do with teaching. I’m new to this profession, so I have a lot of questions, concerns or confusion about what we study at the university and the reality of teaching (second interview).

Furthermore, Carlos revealed that being open and honest about his needs not only allowed him to share his teaching struggles and concerns frankly with his mentor but also reduced his stress and increased his learning capacity: *“I do share my struggling with lesson planning and classroom management, and I always talk to him about that”* (third interview). He also added: *“I’m definitely learning more now because I can simply ask questions knowing that he will not be annoyed.”*

On the other hand, data from the first interview revealed that Mr. Phillip related to Carlos’ needs by sharing his professional experiences to provide him with advice or illustrate a point. For example, Mr. Phillip reported that when Carlos shared his troubles defining certain historical facts and terms in front of the students, he shared his story about the troubles he had with Spanish vocabularies with Carlos to draw an example: *“The reason I share the story academically is to encourage him to know his lesson before he teaches it, especially dealing with ELL kids, make sure he gets the right word.”* Mr. Phillip also revealed that he related to Carlos’ needs by sharing his personal experiences to provide advice or illustrate a point: *“I will share more of my personal information, so I can get him to that point”* (third interview).

Data from one observation session, three individual interviews and one focus group interview revealed that the parties in the Case 1 self-disclosed information about personal and professional topics during the field experience. This exchange of disclosures was influenced by factors such as personal attributes, mentoring philosophy, and PSTs' need. By demonstrating plausible personal attributes, the mentor teacher in Case 1 encouraged his student teachers to open up and share personal and professional information, welcomed them in his classroom, considered their opinions, and ultimately supported relationship building and their learning to teach. Moreover, mentors' mentoring philosophy influenced the communication level between the mentor and PSTs in Case 1 by allowing them feel comfortable exchanging personal or professional information, increasing the level of freedom and creativity PSTs are entitled to have in the classroom, and eventually supporting PSTs' learning to teach. Furthermore, considering PSTs' need may influence information sharing between the mentors and PSTs, and consequently lead to establishing mentoring relationships and supporting PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience. The factors that influenced mentor-mentee self-disclosure in Case 1 contributes to answering research question two.

Self-Disclosure and Learning to Teach

Three sets of individual interviews and one group interview with the participants in Case study 1 contributed to the appearance of this theme. Data revealed that self-disclosure influenced PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience through the following: 1) Self-disclosure and feeling safe and comfortable; 2) self-disclosure as a hidden curriculum; and 3) self-disclosure as a teachable moment. Interview questions for the PSTs and mentors included information about the influence of information sharing on PSTs' learning to teach during this field experience, the influence of information sharing on PSTs' success in their teaching career, the use of information

sharing as a teachable moment, the use of information sharing to explain PSTs' assignments and provide advice, examples and strategies during the field experience (see appendices A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³ and D).

Self-Disclosure and Feeling Safe and Comfortable

Throughout the interviews with the research participants in Case 1, the term “feeling safe and comfortable” was revealed repeatedly. For example, Alice reported that Mr. Phillip's personal attributes (e.g. he is understandable and not by the book, has a sense of humor and welcoming personality) allowed her to ask, share information, and learn comfortably: *“It is nice to talk to someone who understands and knows how to make you comfortable and feel better, if you make mistakes”* (first interview). Also, Carlos described how information sharing created a safe and comfortable environment that influenced his learning eventually:

During the field experience you are expected to learn a lot of things. So, not being able to talk about your concerns, fears, weaknesses, success and struggles, the whole experience would be like hell. We are humans; we socialize. If you give me a difficult task to do in a friendly way, of course, I will do it with confidence; knowing that you will be there to fix my messes (second interview).

Furthermore, Carlos and Alice revealed that sharing struggles, concerns, questions, and personal issues with Mr. Phillip allowed them to relieve stress and anxiety, and focus on learning. Carlos noted: *“When I share my worries with him, he calms me down and says: “Things get better.” or “You are still new at this; you will be fine”* (third interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip reported in the first interview that sharing information whether it was successful or failure allowed his STs to feel safe and comfortable and influenced their learning to teach during the field experience: *“I prepare them to get what I call (soft*

landing). If they screw it up, they are going to survive. We will discuss it to create an environment where that student can feel safe to take the chance.” Also, Mr. Phillip confirmed that the goal of the field experience was to learn: *“I don’t want them to be the teacher they don’t want to be in front of the classroom? I also want them to take chances...and if it fails...it fails; it makes me fresh”* (second interview). Moreover, when asked about the influence of information sharing on STs’ learning to teach, Mr. Phillip claimed that the level of information sharing with STs made the field experience a safe and comfortable one:

Exchanging information increased the comfort level between the mentors and mentees and became friendly toward each other. They realized when they got inputs from us that they weren’t personal, and we weren’t criticizing them, but we were criticizing something they did it (third interview).

During the group interview, Mr. Phillip reported that the amount of information sharing between STs and their mentors led to feeling safe and comfortable during the field experience:

They open up to us because they know that we don’t overreact if they don’t do things perfectly. Besides, student teachers are just like other students in your classroom; you have to have a meaningful relationship with them and make them feel safe to share their concerns and ask questions. If they feel safe, they will not hesitate to open up and express their fears, weaknesses, strengths, success and concerns.

Self-Disclosure as a Hidden Curriculum

During the interviews with the research participants in Case 1, the term “curriculum” was frequently implied. For example, Carlos and Alice reported that Mr. Phillip used information sharing as a curriculum in which he provided examples and explained their assignments. Alice stated:

I feel that what I'm learning here is more than what I learn in my university classes. I feel that my mentor is using information sharing as a way to boost my knowledge and push me to learn more. I studied about the importance of establishing rapport with the students but until you put yourself in the classroom, you see its impact on students' learning and your relationship with them I would have never known that at the university (second interview).

Furthermore, Carlos and Alice revealed that Mr. Phillip used information sharing to model the art of sharing. Carlos mentioned:

I guess he shares with me so I can share with my students, so he is teaching me "the art of sharing" or how to share my information in my teaching. I think he does it to give me a perfect example about things I will go through in my teaching career (third interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip revealed using information sharing to learn about his STs' personal lives to know how to deal with them and what to predict in the classroom:

If they do not have problems at home, they will not bring drama to the classroom. But if I'm dealing with someone with a problem then I can expect problems or higher absences or sickness. Knowing my student teachers will help me predict how they are going to act in the classroom (second interview).

In the group interview, Mr. Phillip confirmed using information sharing as a curriculum in which he provided examples and explained STs' assignments: *"My STs use my stories. You see my STs using my shared experiences in classroom management, lesson planning, interaction with students, etc."*

Self-Disclosure as a Teachable Moment

During the interviews with the research participants in Case 1, the term “teachable moment” was implied. For example, Carlos and Alice reported that Mr. Phillip took advantage of some situations and used information sharing as a teachable moment (e.g. either by relating to the situation or sharing a story that can be applied to the situation) to illustrate a point or provide examples. Carlos noted: *“If I have a personal problem, he usually shares a story through which he provides advice or suggestion”* (second interview). Alice also said in the second interview:

My mentor knows my weaknesses, and he works accordingly to support me. He also relates what is going on in both our lives to what is going on in reality in the classroom. For example, he knows that I’m married and have two twins, so he always relates to that every time I face a behavioral issue with students; he asks “What do you do with your own children when they don’t behave?”

Furthermore, when asked Carlos and Alice to describe an incident through which Mr. Phillip used information sharing as a teachable moment, Alice responded:

He has been leaving me in the classroom all by myself for the last week but yesterday, for example, a fight broke out and my mentor was not there. So when the girl came back at the end of the school day, I had to talk to her by myself. Then I texted him to let him know, and he helped me in terms of writing a report or a statement and then next day we sat with her again, and I was able to see how you talk to a student after she was pretty much assaulted and what steps are going to be (focus group interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip reported taking advantage of some situations and using information sharing as a teachable moment to illustrate a point or draw an example: *“I have given textbooks for very specific reasons which I explain to them. Sometimes, I literally have sat*

them down and shared with them the knowledge and the information they should have picked up or taught for whatever reason” (second interview). Additionally, Mr. Phillip mentioned:

But we tell them the moment they arrive: You are going to screw up, and it is OK because everyone screws up, and this is how we learned to teach. We also tell them those who screw up are the ones who are doing something (group interview).

Furthermore, Mr. Phillip revealed that using information sharing as a teachable moment started once his STs made their first mistake:

I use information sharing to relate to a situation, or I share a story that can be applied to a situation. It usually starts when you see the first big screw-up, and I say: “I have been there and I have done that.” I also use it to reinforce the positives. For example, I say: “I like the way you handled that situation, and I relate to an experience” (third interview).

The finding in the current study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure enhances PSTs’ learning to teach in the field experience. Considering the shift from student to teacher roles, PSTs need a place to relieve stress and anxiety, discuss personal and professional issues, and offer ideas in the classroom. If PSTs do not feel safe and comfortable expressing their needs, struggles and concerns, their expectations for the field experience will be unmet and their problems will remain unsolved. The mentor teacher in Case 1 planned, supported, and collaborated with his PSTs to create a safe and comfortable environment where they can exchange knowledge, resources and experiences, and thus fulfill PSTs’ needs during the field experience.

Moreover, PSTs’ formal curriculum help them learn the professional aspect of teaching, such as assessing students’ learning, planning lessons, and teaching planned lessons. Nonetheless, learning occurs within formal and informal curricula. In the field experience, the

relational nature of mentor-mentee necessitates constant interactions between mentors and PSTs, and this interaction involves personal and professional disclosures. Although mentors and PSTs may not ready their disclosures before they interact, they may relate to their working experiences, favorite food, politics, family, friends and education, and use it as extra schooling resources to make PSTs' assignments natural and related to their life. Thus, mentor-mentee self-disclosure comprises features from interpersonal communication and instructional settings. Case 1 suggests that self-disclosure is a functional tool that can be used by both the mentors and PSTs to improve the PSTs' learning through sharing experiences, feedback, and knowledge.

Furthermore, in the field experience, mentors take advantage of situations and self-disclose their experiences or tell stories through which they help PSTs learn the professional and technical aspects of teaching by explaining assignments or providing live examples. The finding that the mentor-mentee self-disclosure enhanced the PSTs' learning to teach in Case 1 contributes to answering research question three.

Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development

Three sets of individual interviews and one group interview with the participants in Case study 1 contributed to the appearance of this theme. Data revealed that self-disclosure influenced mentoring relationship development during the field experience by increasing the level of closeness and liking, and creating trust and respect between the parties in Case 1. Interviews questions for the PSTs and mentors included information about the characteristics of functional mentoring relationship, characteristics of successful mentors, the decision to share or not share information with the mentor teacher/ PST, challenges PSTs face while teaching and dealing with their mentor, challenges mentors face while dealing with PSTs, the influence of information sharing on mentor-mentee relationship development in the field experience, and the extent to

which mentors and PSTs feel comfortable sharing their personal or professional information in the field experience (see appendices A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³ and D).

Closeness and Liking

Data from the interviews indicated a sign of closeness and liking between the participants in Case 1. For example, when asked: *“Why does Mr. Phillip share his personal information with you,* Carlos answered: *“I think he wants to build rapport with me and help me learn”* (first interview). Also, when asked about the influence of information sharing on building mentoring relationships, Carlos responded: *“It brings us closer”* (second interview). He also remarked: *“I think the closer we get to each other, the more information I get from him.”* Furthermore, when asked about her relationship with her mentor, Alice responded: *“One thing I was really surprised about is how close I got with my mentor. Before I started this field experience, I thought it would be a shallow and strict relationship”* (third interview). Also, when asked about his relationship with his mentor, Carlos replied: *“Since it is the end of the semester, I feel I know a lot about him. We have exchanged plenty of personal stories. I think sharing personal stuff makes the relationship much stronger”* (third interview). Later, Carlos reported an improvement in their mentoring relationship by saying:

I feel more comfortable sharing stuff now because I know more about him. Now I know how passionate he is about helping new teachers, so all this stuff makes me feel closer to him, and open up to him without hesitation (group interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip described information sharing as a bridge that connected mentors and their STs by increasing the level of closeness and liking: *“Both my student teachers have broad intellectual education, and we talk about anything, and that’s rare to find. They are frank and that makes it possible to survive beyond the internship.”* Also, Mr. Phillip reported that

information sharing made both parties in the mentoring relationship feel comfortable and closer towards each other:

It increases the comfort level between the mentors and mentees and become friendly toward each other. In this way they realize when they get inputs from us that they are not personal, and we are not criticizing them, but we are criticizing something they did group interview).

Trust and Respect

Data from the interviews implied a sign of mutual trust and respect between the participants in Case 1. For example, when asked about the influence of information sharing on relationship building with Mr. Phillip, Alice replied:

One time, my mentor told me you caught me in a bad year. I'm not who really I'm when I teach because of my wife's health situation. I believe he shares his personal experiences with me to build a rapport, trust him and open up (second interview).

Similarly, when asked how he could tell that Mr. Phillip felt comfortable sharing information with him, Carlos responded: *"He is open, he sounds comfortable, and when we talk about a student or a problem at school, he trusts me with details"* (second interview). Alice also stated: *"By sharing his information with me not only a relationship is built, but also trust and mutual respect is gained. Now he trusts me to leave me in the classroom by myself because students"* (third interview).

On the other hand, Mr. Phillip noted that sharing personal information should not have a formal structure, and it should occur spontaneously during breaks and preparation times. For example, he mentioned:

My STs never came to me and said we want to share personal information. This comes in a casual way five or ten minutes before class starts in the morning. Let's go get a cup of coffee, or you want to walk outside or go out smoke a cigarette (second interview).

Furthermore, Mr. Phillip reported this sharing should start from general to specific taking advantage of the moment, and ultimately it should advance to a meaningful relationship between the mentor and ST. For instance, *"you talk about neutral subject like you start talking about sports or some other members of the department, and you have laughter."* Additionally, Mr. Phillip remarked that information sharing should lead to a meaningful mentoring relationship based on mutual trust and respect:

They open up to us because they know that we don't overreact if they don't do things perfectly. Besides, student teachers are just like other students in your classroom; you have to have a meaningful relationship with them and make them feel safe to share their concerns and ask questions. If they feel safe, they will trust you and they will open up and express their fears, weaknesses, strengths, success and concerns (focus group interview).

Mentoring relationship is a significant component in the field experience because "any expected results of beginning teachers' learning to teach professionally under the influences of mentoring in induction have to be realized through mentor-novice relationships with certain characteristics" (Wang & Odell, 2007, p 7). Moreover, PSTs prefer mentoring relationship which is based on mutual trust, in that mentors provide PSTs with strategies and feedback about their performance while concurrently allow PSTs to follow their own personal and professional development. The finding in the current study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure sets the foundations of mentoring relationship development in the field experience by increasing the

level of closeness and liking, and creating trust and respect between the PSTs and their mentors. The finding that the mentor-mentee self-disclosure influenced relationship development in Case 1 contributes to answering research question three.

Summary of Case 1

Following the three research questions, three themes were reported: topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, and impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience. The topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience were categorized into personal and professional topics of self-disclosure. Carols and Alice (PSTs) shared their personal information with Mr. Phillip (mentor) to relate to him, relate to their students and ask for advice or opinions. On the other hand, Mr. Phillip shared his personal information with Carlos and Alice to be approachable, understand their personalities, establish a rapport, and create a safe and comfortable learning environment for them. Similarly, while Carlos and Alice shared professional information to obtain strategies, explain their struggles, relieve stress and anxiety, and understand the reality of teaching, Mr. Phillip shared his professional information to provide them with feedback, advice, and examples, make them feel safe and comfortable when they made mistakes.

Furthermore, mentor-mentee self-disclosure was influenced by three factors including, personal attributes, mentoring philosophy and student teacher's need.

Additionally, data revealed that the mentor-mentee self-disclosure influenced the PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience through feeling safe and comfortable, serving as a hidden curriculum, and serving as a teachable moment. Data also revealed that self-disclosure

influenced mentoring relationship development during the field experience by increasing the level of closeness and liking, and creating trust and respect between the PSTs and Mr. Phillip.

Case 2 Gallardo and Ms. Kate

The findings in Case 2 were replicated from Case 1, and reported based on the three themes that are related to research questions: topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, and impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience. The following sections examine each theme in the order above with consideration to the sub-themes which appeared throughout data analysis.

Topics and Purposes of Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

Three sets of individual interviews and one group interview with both participants contributed to the appearance of this theme. Gallardo (PST) and Ms. Kate (mentor) exchanged personal and professional information during the field experience for different purposes. The observation session targeted information sharing that occurred verbally and non-verbally including, gestures, facial and body language, and other types of non-verbal communication. Moreover, the interviews questions for the PSTs and mentor included biographical details, working experience, mentors' teaching and mentoring experiences, school setting, mentoring relationship, topics and purposes of information sharing personal in the field experience (see Appendices A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³, C and D). Table 6 displays the sub-themes of the topics of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in Case 2.

Table 6. Sub-Themes of Topics of Mentor-Mentor Self-Disclosure in Case 2

Personal Self-Disclosure	Professional Self-Disclosure	
	Teaching Struggles	
Family and coaching	Content & Pedagogy	Career development

Personal Topics of Self-Disclosure

Data from observation and individual interviews revealed that Gallardo (PST) and Ms. Kate (mentor) exchanged little personal information about family and coaching during the field experience. This sharing of information was intended differently from each participant. For instance, data revealed that Gallardo tried to share personal information with his mentor as a way to relate to her, and ask for advice and opinions. On the other hand, data also revealed that Ms. Kate shared some personal information to be approachable, understand Gallardo's personality, establish a rapport, and create a safe and comfortable learning environment for him.

At the beginning of observation, Ms. Kate and Gallardo exchanged greetings and used the family names to refer to each other. No exchange for any personal sharing was identified throughout the observation session. Therefore, when asked Gallardo what he knew about Ms. Kate's personal life, he used the term "cold relationship" to describe their relationship: *"Well, I consider anything outside the classroom is personal because she doesn't want to hear it, so we don't share personal stuff per say"* (first interview). Gallardo also mentioned that Ms. Kate shared some personal information about family and coaching; nonetheless, their talks were not deep and their relationship was not healthy:

She talks about her family and coaching or things her kids do. I know where she lives because I gave her rides few times, and we also text. But our relationship is very official. I mean we use the last name which bothers me a lot because it shows me that we are not

close. It bothers me when I see her not referring to me as a colleague. I don't think she likes me or vibes with me.

Moreover, Gallardo believed that reciprocating or sharing personal information with Ms. Kate was "pointless" because she shut him down:

Onetime, I tried to share a personal incident, but I felt being ignored. For example, when we had a rainstorm few weeks ago, my whole kitchen flooded and I had to repair it. So when I mentioned that and wanted to show her pictures for the damage she was like 'Oh.' Basically, she showed no interest at all. So after a couple of days, I tried to open up again to her and told her that they started working on my kitchen in the weekend, she shut me down completely and reminded me to prepare a lesson and teach it on Monday (second interview).

However, Gallardo reported feeling more comfortable sharing personal information with his mentor towards the end than the beginning of the semester: *"It is easier now than before because we have been working together for more than three months and we managed to know each other"* (third interview). Therefore, when asked about the reason why he felt more comfortable sharing personal information at the end of the semester, Gallardo implied that the level of their personal sharing and conversations was increased, and thus, their relationship was improved:

If mentor teachers don't share their experiences, the field experience becomes mechanical. And I don't want a robot teaching me. We are humans; we learn more when we are connected. I wanted to know more about my mentor's personal side, so I know the person I'm dealing with and I know what to predict if I act in a certain way.

On the other hand, Ms. Kate confirmed Gallardo's report for not exchanging personal information with her: *"The gentleman I'm working with doesn't ask any questions. There are things we talk about like family, coaching and school stuff"* (first interview). Ms. Kate also believed that sharing her personal information with Gallardo helped her understand his personality, made her approachable, and helped her expect how things would go in the classroom:

I share some information with him because I want to read his personality and know more about him as a person outside school. This makes it easier for me to understand how to help him; especially when he had unaccomplished assignments, and also helps him seeing me approachable (second interview).

Furthermore, Ms. Kate noted that there was not any reason to share her personal problems with Gallardo: *"Our personal talks are not deep; they are considerate because I don't want to cross the line between student and teacher"* (third interview). Nonetheless, in the focus group interview, Ms. Kate remarked that *"people have the tendency to open up,"* and focused on the importance of exchanging personal information with STs to establish a rapport and connect: *"We get so personal with our student teachers. They know who we are, and they can reach us 24 hours a day if they need us."*

Professional Topics of Self-Disclosure

Data from observation, individual interviews and focus group interview revealed that Gallardo (PST) and Ms. Kate (mentor) exchanged professional information about teaching struggles with content and pedagogical knowledge, and career development. This sharing of information was intended differently from each one of them. For instance, data revealed that Gallardo shared his professional information with his mentor to ask for helpful strategies and

insights, explain his struggles, relieve stress and anxiety, and understand the reality of teaching. On the other hand, data also revealed that Ms. Kate shared her professional information to provide Gallardo with feedback, advice, and live examples during the field experience.

Teaching Struggles

In the first interview, the term “teaching struggles” was mentioned several times. After further investigation, I eventually categorized his “teaching struggles” into struggles with content and pedagogy, and struggles with career development.

Struggles with Content and Pedagogy

Throughout the observation session and interviews with both parties in Case 2, the term “content and pedagogy” was directly mentioned. For example, during the observation session, Ms. Kate shared some professional information through which she provided Gallardo with feedback about his performance in the classroom.

Ms. Kate: I have to tell you that the lesson you gave last week was interesting; however, you used lengthy sentences and plenty of slides. Additionally, I have noticed that you could not keep the students engaged during your lesson.

Gallardo: I could tell from the students’ facial expressions.

Ms. Kate: You just have to keep them interested. You can do that by working on your lessons and using effective strategies.

Ms. Kate: You know, when I started my teaching career I used to ask questions and borrow books from the library to learn my content. Also, I used to attend different classrooms to familiarize myself with different teaching styles.

During the first interview, when asked about what teaching-related information Gallardo shared with his mentor, he revealed sharing his weaknesses in content and pedagogical

knowledge with his mentor to receive advice, and improve his teaching skills: *“During the transition between classes, we usually discuss either what I did well or badly regarding teaching methods or content.”* Gallardo also stated:

I’m learning a lot about the ins and outs of problem-solving. Basically, I’m a fireman without a hose. Every time fire starts, she sprinkles some water on it, and I see how I should put out the fire. When I don’t know how to apply the theories, we were taught at the university, I ask my mentor who usually provides a solution. This has given me comprehensive knowledge on how to apply my theories of classroom management and instruction while doing my job in the classroom (second interview).

Furthermore, Gallardo revealed that sharing such teaching struggles not only made Ms. Kate understand his struggles but also provided him with strategies and live examples on how to overcome such struggles: *“When I tell Ms. Kate about the difficulties I face with classroom management or sometimes the content, she provides me with examples, and explains why I should do this instead of that”* (third interview).

On the other hand, Ms. Kate reported sharing her professional experiences to provide Gallardo with strategies, live examples, and insights to overcome his struggles:

Besides the given assignments, PSTs learn best by teaching and reflecting on the mentors’ feedbacks and shared experiences because what looks on paper doesn’t look exactly as it is in the classroom. So, we would always talk about that mental check system, and do things that would help him stay focused (first interview).

Moreover, when asked what professional information she shared with Gallardo, Ms. Kate responded:

I shared plenty of stories such as the ones how I picked up organizational pieces that I picked up along the way through different teachers and different classrooms I have been in during my student teaching experience as well as teaching myself and going to others' classrooms (third interview).

Career Development Issues

Throughout the interviews with both parties in Case 2, the term "career development" was implied. For example, Gallardo mentioned that sharing concerns and questions related to the instructional processes made him relieve his stress and anxiety:

I share stuff when I notice conflicting information between the program at the university and the real field. It helps me calm down when I'm frustrated. For example, when I share a negative administrative decision, she shows agreement; I guess it is some sort of appeasement (first interview).

Furthermore, Gallardo reported that he exchanged information about school administration, procedural topics and other teaching-related topics with Ms. Kate to understand the reality of teaching: *"We discuss certain students' behavioral issues, procedural topics, the administrative side of the school and other teaching-related topics"* (second interview). He also stated: *"Although she gives me constructive feedback and explains stuff, she rarely reflects on her own experiences. Usually, she is like...mmm I would have done this."*

On the other hand, Ms. Kate noted that information sharing would influence the learning process during the field experience. As a result, she related to Gallardo's concerns, questions or confusions to relieve his stress and anxiety: *"When I share these experiences with him,*

obviously, I want him to feel that it is not an epic failure if he has a rough day, and that things become easier and natural by time” (first interview). Moreover, Ms. Kate reported sharing her professional experiences and teaching struggles to provide Gallardo with feedback, strategies, and live examples to overcome his struggles:

I had talked about my experience when I started teaching and things I had learned, and I provided helpful strategies. For example, constructive criticism, when I was being evaluated and told to change something, I used to take it as do it now. You can ask questions, and tailor what their expectations are and see how you do things (third interview).

Data from one observation session, three individual interviews and one focus group interview revealed that only the mentor in Case 2 self-disclosed information about personal topics, while both parties in the Case 2 self-disclosed information about professional topics during the field experience. The topics of personal disclosure included information about family and coaching. This exchange of personal disclosure was attached to certain purposes. For example, the PST in Case 2 did not self-disclosed personal information because his mentor shut him down. The mentor self-disclosed personal information to build a rapport with her PST, understand her PST’s personality, and predict how things would go in the classroom as well as become approachable.

On the other hand, the topics of professional disclosure included information about struggles with content and pedagogy, and career development. Whereas the PST in Case 2 disclosed his weaknesses in content and pedagogical knowledge to his mentor teacher to receive suggestions, advice, and improve his teaching skills, the mentor shared her professional experiences and teaching struggles to give the PSTs feedback, advice, and examples. Moreover,

while the PST self-disclosed his concerns and questions about career development to relieve stress and anxiety, and understand the reality of teaching, the mentor related to her PST's concerns, questions or confusions to relieve his stress and anxiety as well. The topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure contribute to answering research question one.

Factors that Influence Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

Three sets of individual interviews and one group interview with both parties in Case 2 contributed to this theme. Direct observation also contributed to emergence of its sub-themes. Gallardo and Ms. Kate exchanged personal and professional information during the field experience. This exchange of information was influenced by personal attributes, mentoring philosophy, and student teacher's need. Interviews questions for both the PST and mentor included information about the characteristics of functional mentoring relationship, characteristics of successful mentors, the decision to share or not share information with the mentor teacher/ PST, challenges PSTs face while teaching and dealing with their mentor, challenges mentors face while dealing with PSTs, the initiation of information sharing, the factors that impact the communication level between the PST and mentor, and the extent to which mentors and PSTs feel comfortable sharing their personal or professional information (see appendices A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³ and D).

Personal Attributes

Throughout the observation session and interviews with the participants in Case 2, the term "personal attributes" was mostly implied. For example, data from observation showed that Ms. Kate and Gallardo were sitting relatively far from each other and in the same body orientation position. Before discussing the CAL, silence prevailed as Ms. Kate was looking at the CAL and her notebook. So, Gallardo tried to break the ice by saying: *"It is getting hot again"*

but Ms. Kate did not respond verbally or nonverbally, and continued reading her notes. Then, Ms. Kate asked Gallardo: *“Have you thought about the feedback and suggestions I gave you last week before you wrote your lesson plan for this week?”* Embarrassedly, Gallardo tried to justify his inadequacy, but Ms. Kate turned to a different point. While discussing the CAL, Gallardo tried haplessly to gain Ms. Kate’s interest by smiling and using eye contact and hand gestures; nevertheless, Ms. Kate avoided any eye contact and continued looking in the CAL sheet.

In the first interview, Gallardo reported that Ms. Kate failed to demonstrate plausible personal attributes (e.g. open and understandable personality) to motivate him to open up and share information:

I decided to share information because I feel we should have some sort of bond. There should be some understanding between us. Mentoring is not only technical but also psychological. Also, it is not just telling me “Oh, this is how you teach.” I’m not asking my mentor to be best buddies or to hang out together, but to know who I’m dealing with.

Moreover, Gallardo revealed that his mentor’s attributes (e.g. doesn’t care) not only lowered the level of their communication and information sharing but also precluded his learning to teach during the field experience:

I hesitate to ask questions or even share stuff because her attitude is repulsive. For example, one time I wanted to correct some historical facts she mentioned in the classroom, but she told me in a snooty face that she wasn’t wrong. So, based on that experience I do hesitate to share some stuff, add or even correct her (second interview).

On the other hand, Ms. Kate stated that successful mentors should demonstrate personal attributes (e.g. being open minded, honest, trustworthy, loyal, intelligent, keen, punctual, self-

confident, professional, and modest) to motivate STs to share their experiences, and eventually support their learning to teach (first interview).

Mentoring Philosophy

Throughout the observation session and interviews with both parties in Case 2, the term “mentoring philosophy” was mostly implied. For example, when asked to answer the question *“Who initiated information sharing at the beginning of your field experience?”* Gallardo replied: *“My mentor talked about her family and coaching or things her kids did”* (first interview). Moreover, Gallardo revealed hesitating to share personal or teaching-related issues with his mentor at the beginning of the field experience because his mentor dictated the way he did the lesson planning, and shut him down: *“I hesitate to ask questions sometimes because I feel that I’m held back by type A personality; I have to forget about the things I studied at the university and do things her way”* (second interview). Nonetheless, Gallardo reported that sharing some information with Ms. Kate made him recognize her mentoring philosophy:

I think sharing information helps. It is kind of brutal, but I’m totally able to stand this sort of things. I have tolerance for that. I feel it may be her leadership role and other things but for a great purpose. I may be able to understand my mentor’s way of showing me tough love and tough learning things. I haven’t been given any motivation. I guess my limit is just to receive her comments without being argumentative (third interview).

On the other hand, Ms. Kate noted that sharing personal information should have a formal structure. As a result, she set a date to meet with Gallardo to discuss his learning progress, and to explain his assignments:

We usually meet on Thursdays to discuss his lesson plans that he has been writing for the upcoming week, and we discuss areas that we felt he needs improvement and what he may be struggling with, and we make sure it is right to our population (first interview).

Ms. Kate also reported that they both initiated sharing information and that she allowed Gallardo to call her or text her if he needed any explanation: *“Because we have a busy schedule, we might see each other in the hallway and chat for few minutes. We also text each other and see what is going on. I’m there for him.”* Furthermore, when asked to describe her mentoring style, and how it could be reflected on Gallardo, Ms. Kate replied:

STs should experience everything they can possibly experience now before they try it and figure it out on their own. To do that, I just share everything with Gallardo, so he always knows what is going on. Because the more comfortable he feels, the more likely to be involved he is (second interview).

Later, Ms. Kate described her mentoring style by saying: *“So, if I set the bar high and I don’t help him, he will only get half way. But if I help him, he will meet my expectations and standards”* (group interview).

Student Teacher’s Need

Throughout the observation session and interviews with Gallardo and Ms. Kate, the term “student teacher’s need” was implied. For example, when asked to answer the question *“What made you share his information with Ms. Kate?”* Gallardo revealed sharing his professional information purposefully to receive advice and examples or suggestions: *“I like positive reinforcement. I like to know when I’m doing something right that’s why I share with her. I ask how to apply certain things I’m learning in management classes? And how to apply psychological methods and how realistic are they?”* (first interview). Moreover, he stated:

We usually discuss either what I did well or badly regarding teaching methods or content during the transition time between classes. I also share professional stuff when I feel like I need help or when I hear conflicting information from other teachers (third interview).

On the other hand, data from the second and focus group interviews revealed that Ms. Kate related to Gallardo's needs by sharing her professional experiences to provide him with advice or illustrate a point: *"That's why we do the critical analysis between periods. We say obviously you need to make an adjustment before next class, you need to change, how can you do it? I would do it because I have made the same mistake."*

Data from one observation session, three individual interviews and one focus group interview revealed that both parties in the Case 2 exchanged self-disclosure during the field experience. This exchange of disclosures was influenced by factors such as personal attributes, mentoring philosophy, and PSTs' need. By failing to demonstrate plausible personal attributes, the mentor teacher in Case 2 discouraged his student teacher to open up and share personal and professional information, did not consider his opinions, and ultimately failed to support relationship building and her student teacher's learning to teach. Moreover, mentors' mentoring philosophy influenced the communication level between the mentor and PST in Case 2 by making him feel uncomfortable sharing personal information, decreasing the level of freedom and creativity he is entitled to have in the classroom, and eventually failing to support his learning to teach. Furthermore, considering PSTs' need may influence information sharing between the mentor and PST, and consequently lead to establishing mentoring relationships and supporting PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience. The factors that influenced mentor-mentee self-disclosure in Case 2 contribute to answering the second research question.

Self-Disclosure and Learning to Teach

Data for this theme primarily appeared from three sets of individual interviews and one focus group interview with both parties in Case 2. Data revealed that self-disclosure influenced PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience through the following: 1) Self-disclosure and feeling safe and comfortable; 2) self-disclosure as a hidden curriculum; and 3) self-disclosure as a teachable moment. Interviews questions for both the PST and mentor included information about the influence of information sharing on PST's learning to teach during this field experience, the influence of information sharing on PST's success in their teaching career, the use of information sharing as a teachable moment, the use of information sharing to explain PST's assignments and provide advice, examples and strategies during the field experience (see appendices A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³ and D).

Self-Disclosure and Feeling Safe and Comfortable

Throughout the interviews with Gallardo and Ms. Kate, the expression "feeling safe and comfortable" was directly revealed. For example, during the first interview, Gallardo reported being uncomfortable sharing his personal information with Ms. Kate because it was "*pointless because she shut me down,*" and used the term "cold relationship" to describe their relationship:

I tried to share personal stuff, but I felt being ignored. For example, when we had a rain storm few weeks ago my whole kitchen flooded and I had to repair it. So, when I mentioned that and wanted to show her pictures of the damage, she was like Oh no. Basically, she showed no interest at all. So after a couple of days, I tried to open up again and told her that they started working on my kitchen during the weekend, she shut me down completely (first interview).

Nevertheless, Gallardo reported a development in his relationship with his mentor due to the time they spent working together in the field experience. He stated:

I feel much comfortable than the beginning of the semester because we communicate more and have a better professional rapport than before because we have been working together for more than a couple of months. So, we managed to know each other. Sharing professional stuff with her is helpful and relaxing, and makes me feel better mostly (second interview).

Furthermore, Gallardo remarked that sharing his professional information influenced his learning by allowing him to ask, share information, and learn from his mentor's shared experiences comfortably:

My mentor and I usually have discussions during the transitioning time. For example, I learned from our discussions all about my students. In addition, when I make suggestions or do something wrong that requires feedback, she provides me with constructive feedback and explains why I should do this instead of that. I can't believe that I have written 12 successful lesson plans so far (group interview).

Additionally, Gallardo mentioned that sharing teaching concerns, questions or confusions with Ms. Kate helped him relieve stress and anxiety, and focus on learning: *"Whenever I feel contradiction between what teachers experience at their schools and I what I experience at this school, I share it with Ms. Kate. She usually calms me down, and explains the differences"* (third interview).

On the other hand, Ms. Kate remarked that sharing information was part of the learning process in the field experience. As a result, she shared her professional experiences to help Gallardo relieve stress and anxiety: *"When I share these experiences with him, obviously, I want*

him to feel it is not an epic failure, if he has a rough day, and that things become easier and natural by time” (third interview). Moreover, Ms. Kate used the term “comfort and familiarity” to refer to the influence of information sharing on building comfortable learning environment where STs can share their concerns and ask questions:

The more we share with them, the better and the stronger our relationship will be. Thus, they communicate better and learn faster and better. So, they are more open to us when they feel that the level of comfort and familiarity with us is high (focus group interview).

Self-Disclosure as a Hidden Curriculum

Throughout the interviews with both parties in Case 2, the term “curriculum” was mostly indicated. For example, Gallardo stated: *“I would still know as much about teaching as I did on day one, if it wasn’t for my mentor to reflect on her experiences and show me how to do stuff”* (second interview). He also reported that Ms. Kate used information sharing to provide examples, explain assignments, and deliver a successful learning experience:

By sharing her experiences, she is trying to show me how to apply what I learn at the university in the classroom. I know my content and I know how to teach it, but I don’t know how to teach it in this structure. I feel that her job is to tell me how she did it when she started teaching. So, I think she is teaching me multiple things such as to learn what to do or not to do based on what went right or wrong, and learn everything about the craft of teaching.

He also stated in the third interview: *“I learn by asking questions. I also learn from her advice. You know experienced teachers always have good stories to learn from, mostly.”*

On the other hand, Ms. Kate reported using information sharing to provide Gallardo with advice, strategies, and examples: *“I had talked about my experiences when I started teaching to*

encourage him to use my experiences and stories. You can see these shared experiences while reading his lesson planning or while watching him handling classroom management issues” (second interview).

Additionally, Ms. Kate reported using information sharing to model information sharing for Gallardo: *“So, by building the relationship with my student teachers, I’m telling them that you need to do this with your kids”* (focus group interview). She also stated:

They shadow us and talk to us, so they know the feeling of what the day to day as things pop up and how to hand the situation. So, they should learn how to be fast and make the adjustments you need as a teacher.

Self-Disclosure as a Teachable Moment

Throughout the interviews with Gallardo and Ms. Kate, the term “teachable moment” was mostly implied. For example, Gallardo reported that Ms. Kate took advantage of some situations and used information sharing (e.g. either by relating to the situation or sharing a story that can be applied to the situation) to illustrate a point or provide examples: *“When I share a problem or do something wrong requires feedback, she gives me constructive feedback, and explains why I should do this instead of that”* (first interview). Furthermore, Gallardo mentioned:

Last week, I had the same lesson for two different classes, and it happened that I used slides with notes to refer to the lesson. So after the first class, I talked to my mentor about it, and she liked the way I gave the lesson, but she shared a story about her last student teacher and how he used to use slides with long sentences. She also said that the students were not picking the majority of his notes and sentences because they were long. Then I knew she was using that story to tell me politely that my sentences and notes were long (third interview).

On the other hand, Ms. Kate reported using information sharing to illustrate a point or provide Gallardo with live examples: *“Sometimes, I mess up on purpose to show him that I make mistakes and to show him how I can fix it”* (second interview). Additionally, Ms. Kate revealed:

I can say that in numerous occasions I deliberately allowed the mistakes to happen to talk to him and show him how to recover. Sometimes, I see him going wrong while teaching, but I allow him to continue hoping he will recover. But if he won’t recover, then I talk to him and show him how to do it (focus group interview).

The finding in the current study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure enhances PSTs’ learning to teach in the field experience. Considering the shift from student to teacher roles, PSTs need a place to relieve stress and anxiety, discuss personal and professional issues, and offer ideas in the classroom. If PSTs do not feel safe and comfortable expressing their needs, struggles and concerns, their expectations for the field experience will be unmet and their problems will remain unsolved. The mentor teacher in Case 2 did not plan, support, and collaborate with her PST to create a safe and comfortable environment where he can exchange knowledge, resources and experiences, and thus fulfill his needs during the field experience.

Moreover, PSTs’ formal curriculum help them learn the professional aspect of teaching, such as assessing students’ learning, planning lessons, and teaching planned lessons. Nonetheless, learning occurs within formal and informal curricula. In the field experience, the relational nature of mentor-mentee necessitates constant interactions between mentors and PSTs, and this interaction involves personal and professional disclosures. Although mentors and PSTs may not ready their disclosures before they interact, they may relate to their working experiences, favorite food, politics, family, friends and education, and use it as extra schooling

resources to make PSTs' assignments natural and related to their life. Thus, mentor-mentee self-disclosure comprises features from interpersonal communication and instructional settings. Case 2 suggests that self-disclosure is a functional tool that can be used by both the mentors and PSTs to improve the PSTs' learning through sharing experiences, feedback, and knowledge. Therefore, the finding in this study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure is a functional tool that may be used as an informal curriculum or agenda for teaching PSTs the professional aspects of teaching and as a socializing agent in communication and mentoring relationships building.

Furthermore, in the field experience, mentors take advantage of situations and self-disclose their experiences or tell stories through which they help PSTs learn the professional and technical aspects of teaching by explaining assignments or providing live examples. The finding that the mentor-mentee self-disclosure enhanced the PSTs' learning to teach in Case 2 contributes to answering research question three.

Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development

Data for this theme primarily appeared from three sets of individual and one focus group interviews with both parties in Case 2. Data revealed that self-disclosure influenced mentoring relationship development during the field experience by increasing the level of closeness and liking, and creating trust and respect between the parties in Case 2. Interviews questions for both the PST and mentor included information about the characteristics of functional mentoring relationship, characteristics of successful mentors, the decision to share or not share information with the mentor teacher/ PST, challenges PSTs face while teaching and dealing with their mentor, challenges mentors face while dealing with PSTs, the influence of information sharing on mentor-mentee relationship development in the field experience, and the extent to which

mentors and PSTs feel comfortable sharing their personal or professional information in the field experience (see appendices A², A³, B², B³ and D).

Closeness and Liking

Data from interviews implied a sign of closeness and liking between Gallardo and Ms. Kate. For example, Gallardo noted that the increased amount of information sharing with Ms. Kate improved their mentoring relationship:

We communicate more and we are closer to each other than before. Now we also have a better professional relationship than before. She is friendlier, and she asks my opinion because we have been working together for a while. So, we had a chance to know each other (third interview).

Likewise, Ms. Kate also reported that the improved level of information sharing with her STs improved their mentoring relationship:

I think it is the personal side. We are very personal with our student teachers. They know who we are, and they can reach us 24 hours a day if they need to. I think this's crucial for them to feel our support and know we are there for them, and they can feel that (focus group interview).

Trust and Respect

Throughout the interviews, a sign of mutual trust and respect between Gallardo and Ms. Kate was implied. For example, Gallardo remarked that the increased amount of information sharing with his mentor allowed their mentoring relationship to improve based on trust and respect: *"Now she asks my opinion about things, and makes me feel reliable teacher. Additionally, I can see my input when I look at her tests"* (second interview). Moreover, he stated:

Last month, we had a meeting for History teachers to discuss new methods for helping students, and it happened that I provided more than one valid input during the meeting.

So, this proved to my mentor that I have good content and pedagogical knowledge. Since then, she has been considering my ideas and looking at me as a trustworthy teacher. Thus, I have been feeling a vibe between us (third interview).

On the other hand, Ms. Kate reported that information sharing should lead to a meaningful mentoring relationship based on mutual trust and respect: *“The more we share with them, the better and the stronger our relationship will be. Thus, they communicate better and learn faster and better. So they are more open to us teaching them”* (group interview).

Mentoring relationship is a significant component in the field experience because “any expected results of beginning teachers’ learning to teach professionally under the influences of mentoring in induction have to be realized through mentor-novice relationships with certain characteristics” (Wang & Odell, 2007, p 7). Moreover, PSTs prefer mentoring relationship which is based on mutual trust, in that mentors provide PSTs with strategies and feedback about their performance while concurrently allow PSTs to follow their own personal and professional development. The finding in the current study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure sets the foundations of mentoring relationship development in the field experience by increasing the level of closeness and liking, and creating trust and respect between the PSTs and their mentors. The finding that the mentor-mentee self-disclosure influenced relationship development in Case study 2 contributes to answering research question three.

Summary of Case 2

Following the three research questions, three themes were reported: topics and purposes of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, factors that influence the social

exchange of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience; and impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience. The topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience were categorized into personal and professional topics of self-disclosure. While Ms. Kate (mentor) shared her personal information with Gallardo (PST) to become approachable, understand Gallardo's personality, and expect how things would go in the classroom, Gallardo refrained from sharing his personal information because his mentor shut him down. On the other hand, whereas Gallardo shared his professional information to acquire strategies, relieve stress and anxiety, and understand the reality of teaching, Ms. Kate shared her professional information to provide Gallardo with feedback, advice, and examples, make him feel safe and comfortable when he made mistakes.

Furthermore, the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in Case 2 was influenced by three factors: personal attributes, mentoring philosophy, and student teacher's need.

Additionally, data revealed that the mentor-mentee self-disclosure influenced Gallardo's learning to teach during the field experience through feeling safe and comfortable, serving as a hidden curriculum, and serving as a teachable moment. Data also revealed that professional self-disclosure influenced mentoring relationship development during the field experience by increasing the level of closeness and liking, and creating trust and respect between Gallardo and Ms. Kate.

Cross-Case Analysis

A cross-case analysis of the three themes is provided to allow the reader to understand the similarities and differences between the two cases, and to test the findings based on Yin's (1994) replication method of analysis. Replication is a method of triangulation that aims at

examining the relationships among the findings within a case first, and then compares the patterns and similarities across the cases, looking for similarities and patterns. If similarities are not found among the multiple cases, the researcher has to reexamine his/ her initial themes. On the other hand, if similarities are found among the cases, literal replication will be attained. Meanwhile, if similarities are not found among cases, but for anticipated causes, theoretical replication will be attained (Yin, 1994).

Table 7. Sub-Themes from Two Case Studies

Case 1			Case 2	
	Personal SD	Professional SD	Personal SD	Professional SD
Theme 1	family, religion, working experience, cultural and historical facts, and personal problems	Content & Pedagogy and career development	Family and coaching	Content & Pedagogy and career development
Theme 2	Personal Attributes, Mentoring Philosophy and ST's Need Only (Carlos & Mr. Phillip)		Personal Attributes, Mentoring Philosophy and ST's Need	
Theme 3-1	Feeling safe and comfortable, hidden curriculum, and teachable moment		Feeling safe and comfortable, hidden curriculum, and teachable moment	
Theme 3-2	Closeness & liking, and trust & respect		Closeness & liking, and trust & respect	

Topics and Purposes of Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

In this study, the majority of the PST participants in the two cases exchanged personal information with their mentors to build a rapport, explain their situation, and receive advice and suggestions. Additionally, the mentor participants shared their personal information to establish a rapport with their STs, understand their personalities, and predict how things would go in the classroom.

Nevertheless, whereas the participants in Case 1 exchanged personal information about family, religion, working experience, childhood, cultural and historical facts, and personal problems, only the mentor participant in Case 2 shared some personal information about family and coaching. Moreover, although the PSTs in the two cases exchanged personal information with their mentors, their sharing of information was intended differently. For example, Carlos shared information about cultural and historical facts with Mr. Phillip to relate to their students. Alice and Gallardo described their mentors as “knowledgeable.” Nonetheless, Alice shared information about cultural and historical facts to hear Mr. Phillip’s opinion, knowledge, and experience; while Gallardo refrained from sharing personal information with his mentor because she shut him down. Additionally, Carlos and Alice shared their personal problems with Mr. Phillip to explain their situations and to receive personal advice and suggestions: “If I have a personal problem, he usually shares a story through which he provides advice or suggestion” (Carlos). In contrast with Case 1, Gallardo, the PST in Case 2 described his relationship with Ms. Kate as “a cold relationship,” and refrained from sharing personal problems with his mentor. Furthermore, while Mr. Phillip believed that exchanging personal information should not have a formal structure and should start spontaneously taking advantage of the opportunity, Ms. Kate believed in setting up a date to meet with Gallardo.

Also, unlike Mr. Phillip who exchanged personal problems with Carlos and Alice to understand their personalities, and predict how things would go with them in the classroom, Ms. Kate believed that there was no reason to share personal problems with Gallardo. She noted: *“Our personal talks were not deep, they were considerate. It is not professional and not comfortable. I don’t want to cross the line between student and teacher.”*

Although Gallardo, unlike the majority of participants, refrained from sharing his personal information, he did for anticipated reason “she shut me down;” therefore, a theoretical replication was attained (Yin, 1994).

In sharing professional information, a general agreement among the PST participants in the two cases revealed that they shared their struggles with content and pedagogy, and career development to explain their struggles, receive feedback, improve their teaching skills, understand the reality of teaching, and relieve stress and anxiety. Likewise, the mentors in the two cases shared their professional experiences and teaching struggles to provide the PSTs with feedback, advice, examples, and relieve their stress and anxiety.

However, besides relieving stress and anxiety, and understanding the reality of teaching, Alice in case 1 also shared her concerns about career development with Mr. Phillip to learn about her performance. Furthermore, both mentors related to the PSTs and shared their professional information to relieve their stress and anxiety; nonetheless, Mr. Phillip believed that his STs did not have teaching struggles: *“They don’t have that much teaching or teaching experience because I’m usually in the room with them when they are teaching.”* Therefore, since similarities regarding sharing professional information were found among the two cases, literal replication was attained (Yin, 1994).

Factors that Influence the Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

A general agreement among the participants in the two cases revealed that mentors’ personal attributes influenced information sharing between the PSTs and their mentor teachers. Nonetheless, data from observation sessions showed that Mr. Phillip and his STs sat relatively close to each other in a direct body orientation position, expressed their emotions facially and vocally while sharing personal information, and exchanged gestures and eye contacts. Whereas

Ms. Kate and Gallardo sat relatively far from each other and in the same body orientation position and did not exchange gestures and eye contact. Moreover, while Alice and Carlos believed that their mentor's plausible attributes increased the level of their information sharing, Gallardo believed that his mentor's negative attributes not only lowered the level of their information sharing but also precluded his learning: *"I hesitate to ask questions or even share some information because sometimes, her attitude is repulsive."*

Moreover, the participants in the two cases agreeably revealed that mentors' mentoring philosophy in welcoming PSTs in their classrooms, sharing information, experiences and resources, encouraging open discussions, and providing PSTs with feedback and support not only influenced the level of communication and information sharing between the PSTs and their mentor teachers but also supported PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. Although the PSTs in two cases reported being hesitant to share personal or teaching-related information with their mentors at the beginning of the field experience, they did for different reasons. For example, Alice and Carlos hesitated to share their information because of their mentor's situation at home: *"I know he has a lot going on. I can't even imagine how he can be teaching and mentoring with everything going on with his wife"* (Alice). Meanwhile, Gallardo, hesitated to share his personal and teaching-related information with Ms. Kate because she dictated the way he did the lesson planning, and shut him down: *"I hesitate to ask questions sometimes because I feel that I'm held back by type A personality. Basically, I have to forget about things I studied at the University, and I have to do things her way."*

Furthermore, unlike Alice, all the other participants in the two cases believed that PSTs' need influenced the level of communication and information sharing between the PSTs and their mentor teachers in the field experience. Besides Alice's belief about the influence PSTs' need

placed on information sharing between the PSTs and their mentor teachers in the field experience, similarities regarding the factors that influence the social exchange of mentor-mentee self-disclosure were found among the two cases. Therefore, literal replication was attained (Yin, 1994).

Self-Disclosure and Learning to Teach

A general agreement among the participants in the two cases revealed that exchanging information created a comfortable learning environment that allowed the PSTs to ask, and share positive and negative experiences with their mentors comfortably. Nevertheless, whereas the participants in Case 1 believed that sharing both personal and professional information created a comfortable learning environment, the participants in Case 2 technically believed that only sharing professional information created such an environment since they did not share personal information during the field experience. For example, Gallardo used the term “cold relationship” to describe his relationship with his mentor, and reported not being comfortable sharing personal information with Ms. Kate.

Moreover, the participants in the two cases consensually believed that the mentors used information sharing as a curriculum to provide the PSTs with examples, strategies, and feedback. However, unlike Gallardo, Carlos and Alice reported that their mentor teacher used information sharing as a curriculum through which he modeled information sharing: *“I guess he shares with me so I can share with my students, so he is teaching me the art of sharing”* (Carlos).

Furthermore, a general agreement among the participants in the two cases indicated that the mentors in the two cases used information sharing as a teachable moment to illustrate a point or provide examples. For example, Ms. Kate mentioned: *“Sometimes we mess up on purpose to show them that we make mistakes, and show them how we fix them.”* Also, Mr. Phillip reported:

“Sometimes I literally have sat them down and shared with them the knowledge and the information they should have taught.” Since similarities regarding the influence of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on PSTs’ learning to teach in the field experience were found among the two cases, literal replication was attained (Yin, 1994).

Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development

A general agreement among the participants in the two cases revealed that exchanging information increased the level of liking and closeness between the PSTs and their mentors. For example, Alice stated: *“One thing I was really surprised about is how close I got with my mentor. Before I started this field experience I thought it would be a shallow and strict relationship.”* Nonetheless, the PSTs in the two cases felt close to their mentors for different reasons and at different phases of the field experience. For example, Carlos had the feelings of liking and closeness for and by Mr. Phillip at an early stage of the field experience when he noticed the difference between Mr. Phillip’s mentoring philosophy and his previous mentor’s in Practicum I. Also, Alice had the feelings of “liking and closeness” for and by Mr. Phillip at a relatively early stage of the field experience; however, she could not understand Mr. Phillip’s mentoring philosophy at the beginning, which delayed having such feelings: *“The first week was rough because I didn’t understand him. He was not taking me seriously because I switched, but once we started talking and sharing stuff, he got to know me.”* On the other hand, Gallardo had the feelings of “liking and closeness” for and by Ms. Kate at a relatively later stage of the field experience: *“I feel much comfortable than the beginning of the semester because we have been working together for more than couple of months, so we got to know each other.”*

Additionally, the participants in the two cases agreeably believed that exchanging information led to establishing meaningful mentoring relationships based on mutual trust and

respect. Nevertheless, the PSTs in the two cases perceived their mentoring relationships as trustful for different purposes and at different stages of the field experience. For example, although Carlos and Alice trusted Mr. Phillip at an early stage of the field experience, Alice felt not being trusted by Mr. Phillip due to her inefficiency in pedagogy: *“Now he leaves me in the classroom by myself because students were not taking me seriously.”* On the other hand, Gallardo trusted and felt trusted by Ms. Kate at the end of the field experience as he started to demonstrate and apply pedagogical knowledge in the classroom:

Last month, we had a meeting for history teachers and social studies to discuss new methods for helping students and it happened that I provided more than one valid input during the meeting. So this proved to my mentor that I have good content and pedagogical knowledge. Since then, she has been considering my opinions and looking at me as a reliable teacher. Thus, I have been feeling a vibe between us, which enables me to express my opinions freely.

As similarities regarding the influence of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on mentoring relationship development in the field experience were found among the two cases, literal replication was attained (Yin, 1994).

Summary

The purpose of Chapter Four was to present the findings of this multiple case study. For each case study, the findings were reported based on the three themes that are related to research questions: topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, and impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience. The findings in this chapter were reported in

two different ways including, a description of participants, themes and sub-themes that emerged from the data analysis of each case study separately, and a comparison of the findings from the two cases collectively.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Chapter Five discusses the findings of the current study. The chapter begins by providing a summary of the major findings is provided. The discussion section then follows explaining the findings in relation to the theories and literature mentioned in the previous chapters. This chapter also provides implications for future studies, limitations of the current study, and a summary for the data collected and analyzed, Finally, Chapter Five draws a final conclusion for this dissertation.

This multiple case study examined the mentor-mentee self-disclosure as an approach to informal communication and its effects on the mentoring relationships, and preservice teachers' learning to teach during the field experience. Data for this qualitative study were collected through three phases and via multiple sources (videoed CAL, and individual and focus group interviews) to enhance the reliability and credibility of data (Miller, 2007; Yin, 2003). As a result, an enormous amount of data was generated (Lester, 1999). Moreover, data analysis was conducted through two phases and utilized by the replication method (Yin, 1994). The findings were reported based on the three themes that are related to research questions: topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, and impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience.

This study was guided by three primary questions:

- 1- What are the topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience?

- 2- What are the factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience?
- 3- How do mentors and preservice teachers use self-disclosure as a tool to enhance the mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach?

Summary of the Main Findings

The findings in the current study were reported based on the three themes that are related to research questions: topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, and impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience. Each of the research questions was answered by the qualitative data gathered from the observation sessions, individual interviews and focus group interviews in two case studies. The three research questions are addressed in the following sections.

Research Question One

The findings in the study revealed that both parties in the two cases self-disclosed information about personal and professional topics during the field experience. The topics of personal disclosure included information about family, religion, working experience, childhood, cultural and historical facts, and personal problems. This exchange of personal disclosure was attached to certain purposes. For example, the PSTs self-disclosed personal information to build rapport with their mentor teachers, relate to their students, receive advices, and understand the reality of teaching. Similarly, the mentors self-disclosed personal information to build a rapport with the PSTs, understand the PSTs' personalities, and predict how things would go in the classroom as well as become approachable.

On the other hand, the topics of professional disclosure included information about struggles with content and pedagogy, and career development. Whereas the PST participants in the two cases disclosed their weaknesses in content and pedagogical knowledge to their mentor teachers to receive suggestions, advice, and improve their teaching skills, the mentors shared their professional experiences and teaching struggles to give the PSTs feedback, advice, and examples. Moreover, while the PSTs self-disclosed their concerns and questions about career development to relieve stress and anxiety, and understand the reality of teaching, the mentors related to their PSTs' concerns, questions or confusions to relieve their stress and anxiety as well.

Research Question Two

Data from one observation session, three individual interviews and one focus group interview revealed that the parties in two cases self-disclosed information about personal and professional topics during the field experience. This exchange of disclosures was influenced by factors such as personal attributes, mentoring philosophy, and PSTs' need. By demonstrating plausible personal attributes, the mentor teachers encouraged his student teachers to open up and share personal and professional information, welcomed them in his classroom, considered their opinions, and ultimately supported relationship building and their learning to teach. Moreover, mentors' mentoring philosophy influenced the communication level between the mentors and PSTs in the two cases by allowing them feel comfortable exchanging personal or professional information, increasing the level of freedom and creativity PSTs are entitled to have in the classroom, and eventually supporting PSTs' learning to teach. Furthermore, considering PSTs' need may influence information sharing between the mentors and PSTs, and consequently leads

to establishing mentoring relationships and supporting PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience.

Research Question Three

The finding in the current study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure enhances PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. Considering the shift from student to teacher roles, PSTs need a place to relieve stress and anxiety, discuss personal and professional issues, and offer ideas in the classroom. If PSTs do not feel safe and comfortable expressing their needs, struggles and concerns, their expectations for the field experience will be unmet and their problems will remain unsolved. The mentor teachers should plan, support, and collaborate with PSTs to create a safe and comfortable environment where they can exchange knowledge, resources and experiences, and thus fulfill PSTs' needs during the field experience.

Moreover, PSTs' formal curriculum help them learn the professional aspect of teaching, such as assessing students' learning, planning lessons, and teaching planned lessons. Nonetheless, learning occurs within formal and informal curricula. In the field experience, the relational nature of mentor-mentee necessitates constant interactions between mentors and PSTs, and this interaction involves personal and professional disclosures. Although mentors and PSTs may not ready their disclosures before they interact, they may relate to their working experiences, favorite food, politics, family, friends and education, and use it as extra schooling resources to make PSTs' assignments natural and related to their life. Thus, mentor-mentee self-disclosure comprises features from interpersonal communication and instructional settings.

The finding in this study suggests that self-disclosure is a functional tool that can be used by both the mentors and PSTs to improve the PSTs' learning through sharing experiences, feedback, and knowledge. For example, in a mentoring context, the mentor-mentee self-

disclosure may be used as instructional tool to explain PSTs' assignments (Cayanus, 2004), and to provide PSTs with knowledge, strategies, advice and live examples. Therefore, the finding in this study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure is a functional tool that may be used as an informal curriculum or agenda for teaching PSTs the professional aspects of teaching and as a socializing agent in communication and mentoring relationships building.

Additionally, in the field experience, mentors take advantage of situations and self-disclose their experiences or tell stories through which they help PSTs learn the professional and technical aspects of teaching by explaining assignments or providing live examples.

Furthermore, Mentoring relationship is a significant component in the field experience because "any expected results of beginning teachers' learning to teach professionally under the influences of mentoring in induction have to be realized through mentor-novice relationships with certain characteristics" (Wang & Odell, 2007, p 7). Moreover, PSTs preferred mentoring relationship which was based on mutual trust, in that mentors provided PSTs with strategies and feedback about their performance while concurrently allowed PSTs to follow their own personal and professional development. The finding in the current study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure sets the foundations of mentoring relationship development in the field experience by increasing the level of closeness and liking, and creating trust and respect between the PSTs and their mentors.

Interpretation of the Findings

This section incorporates the findings of the current study with previous research, considering whether the findings converge with or diverge from the results of previous research of mentor-mentee self-disclosure. Also, besides the interpretations and implications of the finding, this section provides limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.

Interrelated Topics and Purposes of Self-Disclosure

Personal Topics of Self-Disclosure

In the field experience, the mentors' support for PSTs' learning includes three active roles: emotional support systems, socializing agents, and instructional coaches (Butler & Cuenca, 2012). The personal topics of mentor-mentee self-disclosure are important elements in the socialization process for mentoring PSTs in the field experience. When the mentor and PST exchange personal information, they engage in a social system that aims at building mentoring relationships. Moreover, this socialization process indicates a reciprocal exchange of information, experiences resources and support from both parties, which improves PST's learning to teach.

The result of self-disclosing personal information related to family, religion, working experience, childhood, cultural and historical facts, and personal problems confirms the results from the previous studies (Downs, Javidi & Nussbaum, 1988; Holladay, 1984; Javidi & Long, 1989; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Minger, 2004) in which they identified "family, beliefs and opinions, leisure activities, friend, relatives, hobbies, favorite foods, personal characteristics, and personal problems" as topics of teachers' self-disclosure. Moreover, self-disclosing information to build a rapport, explain situations, receive advice and suggestion as well as create a friendly environment agrees with the findings from previous studies (Derlega & Grzelak, 1979; Gregory, 2005; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Rosenfeld & Kendrick, 1984) in which they considered "building a rapport with students, gaining feedback, self-explaining, creating a comfortable learning environment, and obtaining control" the purposes of teacher's self-disclosure in the classroom.

Despite the fact that previous studies (Downs, Javidi & Nussbaum, 1988; Holladay, 1984; Javidi & Long, 1989; Minger, 2004) concerned the appropriateness of the topics of teachers' self-disclosure, and did not explore whether the topics of teachers' self-disclosure were personal or professional, these studies extended the findings to the ones in the current study. The findings in this study indicate that mentor-mentee self-disclosure is part of PSTs' informal curriculum through which the mentors and PSTs use their personal information as extra schooling resources and relate to their working experiences, favorite food, politics, family, friends and education to establish rapport, and make PSTs' assignments natural and related to their life. In addition, this exchange of personal information allows the mentors to learn more about their preservice teachers' personal lives while disclosing their personal experiences, and thus enhance the mentoring process.

Professional Topics of Self-Disclosure

This study explored the professional topics of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience as well. Such topics involved information about struggles with content and pedagogy, and career development. Self-disclosing information about such topics was intended differently by the PSTs and mentors. For example, the PSTs self-disclosed their struggles with content and pedagogy to receive advice and improve their teaching skills as well as explain their struggles to their mentors, while they self-disclosed concerns, fears and confusions about career development to relieve stress and anxiety, and understand the reality of teaching. Similarly, the mentor teachers self-disclosed professional experiences related to content and pedagogy, and career development to relieve PSTs' stress and anxiety, and provide them with feedback, advice and live examples.

The result of self-disclosing teaching struggles to receive advice, improve teaching skills and explain struggles agrees with the findings from previous studies (Downs, Javidi & Nussbaum, 1988; Gregory, 2005; Holladay, 1984; Javidi & Long, 1989; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Minger, 2004) in which they identified “professional experiences” as a topic of teacher self-disclosure. Also, self-disclosing teaching struggles with receiving advice and feedback, and relieving stress and anxiety confirms the findings from previous studies (Derlega & Grzelak, 1979; Downs, Javidi & Nussbaum, 1988; Gregory, 2005; Rosenfeld & Kendrick, 1984) in that they documented the purposes of teacher’s self-disclosure as to simplify, explain and apply course material, release emotions, and gain or provide feedback.

Moreover, self-disclosing difficulties with career development to understand the reality of teaching confirms the studies of mentoring in teacher education (Christ, 2004; Bradbury & Koballa, 2008) in that mentor-mentee self-disclosure helps mentees acquire the knowledge necessary to succeed in the early stages of their teaching career. The studies also claimed that inadequate mentor-mentee self-disclosure would not prepare preservice teachers to face the conflict between the reality of teaching and their expectations, and consequently they would reject adaptation. Additionally, the result is also similar to the studies of supervisor self-disclosure in clinical counseling in that supervisor-supervisee self-disclosure increased supervisees’ chances to learn and succeed at the initial stages of their career (St-Jean, 2012; St-Jean & Mathieu, 2011; Wanberg et al., 2007).

Despite the fact that previous studies (Downs, Javidi & Nussbaum, 1988; Holladay, 1984; Javidi & Long, 1989) examined instructors’ self-disclosure in college settings or counselor supervision, and concerned the appropriateness of teacher’s topics of self-disclosure, these studies extended the findings in the current study. The findings in this study indicate that the

mentor-mentee self-disclosure is part of the PSTs' informal curriculum. In the field experience, the mentors and PSTs use their professional information as extra schooling resources through which they exchange experiences about content and pedagogy and career development to provide PSTs with feedback and suggestions, relieve their stress and anxiety, and help them understand the reality of teaching.

Factors that Influence Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure

Personal Attributes

Sharing or not sharing, what to share or what not to share among mentors and mentees are determined by several factors: personal attributes, mentoring philosophy, and preservice teacher's need.

Successful mentors are skilled in interpersonal communication, devoted to learning and reliable (Moir, 2009), and provide PSTs with emotional support (Beck & Kosnick, 2002). It also has been said that successful mentors demonstrate truthfulness, kindness, passion, patience, stability, and a plausible attitude as well as set a professional example for PSTs to follow, and (Hurst & Reding, 2002). Danin and Bacon (1999) reported that PSTs indicated a sign of gratification as their mentor teachers were "trustworthy, supportive, and willing to listen" (p. 204). As a result, Danin and Bacon argued that mentor teachers' interpersonal skills should be improved. Kilburg (2007) argued that the lack of mentors' emotional support made PSTs "more apt to have anxiety, insecurity and lack of confidence" (p. 297).

Establishing functional mentoring relationship in the field experience is a key in mentors' success (Moir et al., 2009). Mentoring relationship has been described as "give and take" and as a sign of care between the mentor and PST (Glenn, 2006, p. 5). Moreover, Glenn (2006) argued without mentoring relationship, the influence of the field experience will be partial.

The finding of mentor-mentee self-disclosure being influenced by personal attributes confirms the results from previous studies (Clutterbuck, 2004; Gravells, 2006; Farber et al., 1989; Liston & Zeichner, 1991; Shea, 1994) in that they argued that the field experience was not only intended to teach PSTs the professional aspects of teaching but also the social aspects of teaching. Therefore, such studies recommended the mentors and PSTs to open up and communicate to achieve the desired outcomes of the field experience. Moreover, other research (Hudson, 2013) highlighted the importance of demonstrating personal attributes on the level of communication and information sharing, and recommended PSTs to be open for relationship building and committed to their learning. The finding also supported other studies (Miller & Jablin, 1991; Morrison, 1993; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Perrewé et al., 2002) in that mentor-mentee level of communication and information sharing was influenced by certain factors; one of which was individual differences and qualities.

Although previous research ignored the influence of “personal attributes” on mentor-mentee self-disclosure in establishing mentoring relationships, and whether such attributes facilitate or hinder the mentoring process and PSTs’ learning to teach during the field experience, they highlighted the influence of personal attributes on the level of communication and information sharing between the mentors and mentees. Thus, the finding in this study contributes to the research of self-disclosure in mentoring. During the field experience, the mentors’ and PSTs’ personal attributes provide the impression based on which the mentors and PSTs decide to disclose or not. If the mentor and PST perceive each other’s personal attributes as plausible, they may decide to self-disclose more which in turns strengthens their mentoring relationships to strengthen, and increases the PST’s chances to learn to teach. For example, Alice (PST in Case 1) reported that her mentor’s personal attributes encouraged her to open up and

share her information, and ultimately supported her learning to teach. Instead, if the mentor and PST perceive each other's personal attributes as repulsive, they may not engage in self-disclosure which in turns weakens their mentoring relationship, and decreases the PST's chances to learn to teach. For example, Gallardo (PST in Case 2) reported that his mentor's personal attributes lowered the level of their communication and information sharing, and also precluded his learning to teach.

Mentoring Philosophy

Further, the finding of mentor-mentee self-disclosure being influenced by mentors' mentoring philosophy confirms the findings from previous studies (Carver, 2009; Gravells, 2006; Sanderson, 2003) as they argued that the mentors were responsible for enculturating the PSTs in the schools environments, welcoming PSTs in their classrooms, encouraging open discussions, and providing PSTs with feedback and support. Other studies (Lampert et al., 2013; Walsh et al., 2002) also argued that the supervisors who implemented a reciprocal and collaborative supervisory philosophy, and showed interest in their supervisees' success would establish a supervisory relationship which encouraged, stimulated and responded to the supervisees' self-disclose. Furthermore, this finding is consistent with the research of mentoring in teacher education (Wang, Strong & Odell, 2004) in which they reported that the type and focus of the mentor-mentee conversations in the field experience were linked to different styles and structures of teaching, mentoring and curriculum.

Although previous research did not identify which philosophies mentors should implement, and ignored the influence of "mentoring philosophy" on facilitating or hindering the mentoring process and PSTs' learning to teach, they extended the findings in the current study. In the field experience the mentors facilitate the sharing of knowledge, resources and

experiences, and welcome PSTs in their classrooms. Thus they set the foundations of mentoring relationships, and enhance the PST's chances to learn to teach. For example, Carlos (PST in Case 1) revealed that recognizing his mentor's mentoring philosophy not only allowed him to share his struggles and concerns comfortably but also increased his learning capacity. Nonetheless, recruiting mentor teachers does not comply with official standards, and is not based on distinguishing or competitive qualities other than teaching experience. The two mentor teachers in this study reported having insufficient training which allowed them to develop their mentoring philosophies, and practice mentoring without understanding how their philosophies influence mentoring practices as well as how such practices negatively or positively influence mentees' learning to teach. Therefore, in order to develop mentoring practices, philosophies and knowledge, intensive mentoring training programs based on literature and empirical data is necessitated.

Preservice Teacher's Need

Additionally, the results also indicated that mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience was influenced by preservice teacher's need. This finding is consistent with previous studies in teacher education (Hellsten et al., 2009; O'Brien & Goddard, 2006) in that the levels of interactions between the mentor and mentee resulted from the level of mentor's supportiveness in sharing of resources and information, risk-taking, and listening attentively to preservice teacher's need. This finding contributes to the research of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience in that "preservice teacher's need" can be considered an important factor that influences the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure. In the field experience, the mentors learn more about the PSTs' needs while disclosing their information, and provide them with suggestions and strategies, and thus enhance the mentoring

process and PSTs' learning to teach. Also, such a finding is significant for future studies of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience.

Self-Disclosure and Learning

Mentor-mentee self-disclosure influenced PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. This study shows that self-disclosure helps create a safe and comfortable environment, serve as a hidden curriculum, and serve as a teachable moment.

Comfortable Environment

In the field experience, mentors are requested to "constantly maintain a sense of mutual support and confidentiality" (Anzul, 2000). Mentor teachers are familiar with their schools policies and procedures; therefore, they should plan, support, and collaborate to provide PSTs with a "structure and support during a new teacher's transition to the demands of the classroom and school environments" (Gibb & Welch, 1998, p. 22). Additionally, mentor teachers recognize that PSTs' emotional distress is inevitable (Sutton, 2000) and also periodic (Mauer & Zimmerman, 2000), thus, they help PSTs adjust their expectations, and project their teaching career overtime. Mentor teachers also distinguish that PSTs' feelings of incompetency in case of making mistakes are normal (Ammon & Lidstone, 2002; Watson, 2007); therefore, they reflect on their own experiences in earlier teaching career to encourage PSTs to accept difficulties and mistakes in their classrooms, thus support PSTs' in their career developmental stage (Nieto, 2009).

The finding of the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on creating a comfortable learning environment for PSTs to learn to teach in the field experience agrees with the research of supervisor self-disclosure in clinical counseling (Wanberg, Welsh, & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2007) in which they argued that supervisor-supervisee self-disclosure allowed the supervisees to

feel safe to disclose failure experiences, and motivated their supervisors to self-disclose similar experiences in earlier career, and thus enhanced supervisees' learning. The finding in this study also supported the other studies (Hudson, 2013; Knox et al., 2011; Ladany & Walker, 2003; Sanderson, 2003) in that mentor-mentee self-disclosure influenced mentees' emotional elements and reduced their stress and anxiety. In the research of mentoring in teacher education, scholars (Lampert et al., 2013; Sanderson, 2003) argued that the mentor-mentee interaction in the field experience created a positive environment that allowed the PSTs to work side by side with the mentors and learn all the aspects related to teaching. On the other hand, other studies in teacher education (Lu, 2013; Valencia et al., 2009) although examined the triadic interaction in the field experience between PSTs, mentors, and university supervisors, did not find the same result. They claimed that such interaction minimized the PSTs' opportunity to learn to teach as a result of the lack of the feedback received on methods courses, teaching subject materials and pedagogical knowledge.

The finding in the current study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure enhances the PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. Considering the shift from student to teacher roles, PSTs need a place to relieve stress and anxiety, discuss personal and professional issues, and offer ideas in the classroom. If PSTs do not feel safe and comfortable expressing their needs, struggles and concerns, their expectations for the field experience will be unmet and their problems will remain unsolved. For example, Gallardo (PST in Case 2) revealed hesitating to share personal or teaching-related issues with his mentor at the beginning of the field experience because his mentor dictated the way he did the lesson planning, and shut him down. The mentor teachers should plan, support, and collaborate with PSTs to create a safe and comfortable

environment where they can exchange knowledge, resources and experiences, and thus fulfill PSTs' needs during the field experience.

Hidden Curriculum

General curriculum has been defined as “all the organized and intended experiences of the student for which the school accepts responsibility” (Ryan & Cooper, 2007, p. 114). Later, Ryan and Cooper added that a curriculum may cover the teaching methods, communication, and activities that improve “life experience.” In the field experience, PSTs' formal curriculum help them learn the professional aspect of teaching, such as assessing students' learning, planning lessons, and teaching planned lessons. Nonetheless, learning occurs within formal and informal curricula. Street (2004) stated that new teachers learn to teach “in a highly social and dynamic space” (p.7), and recommended investigating the sharing of cultural and social learning experiences between the mentors and novice teachers. Also, Combleth (1990) described curriculum as “ongoing social process comprised of the interactions of students, teachers, knowledge and milieu.” Moreover, the mentors' job includes three active roles: emotional support systems, socializing agents, and instructional coaches (Butler & Cuenca, 2012). Thus, PSTs' curriculum refers to “organic process by which learning is offered, accepted and internalized” (Newman & Ingram, 1989, p. 1).

The finding of the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience by serving as a curriculum confirms the studies of supervisor self-disclosure in clinical counseling in that supervisors used self-disclosure as a method to influence supervisees' learning (Ladany & Walker, 2003; Knox et al., 2011; St-Jean, 2012; St-Jean & Mathieu, 2011; Wanberg et al., 2007). Researchers of mentoring in teacher education (Lampert et al., 2013; Sanderson, 2003; Wang et al., 2004) argued that the mentors used their

conversations and interaction as a means to facilitate PSTs learning to teach in the field experience.

In the field experience, the relational nature of the mentor-mentee necessitates constant interactions between mentors and PSTs, and this interaction involves personal and professional disclosures. Although mentors and PSTs may not ready their disclosures before they interact, they may relate to their working experiences, favorite food, politics, family, friends and education, and use it as extra schooling resources to make PSTs' assignments natural and related to their life. Thus, the mentor-mentee self-disclosure comprises features from interpersonal communication and instructional settings. For example, in a mentoring context, the mentor-mentee self-disclosure may be used as instructional tool to explain PSTs' assignments (Cayanus, 2004), and to provide PSTs with knowledge, strategies, advice and live examples. Therefore, the finding in this study suggests that the mentor-mentee self-disclosure is a functional tool that may be used as an informal curriculum or agenda for teaching PSTs the professional aspects of teaching, and as a socializing agent in communication and mentoring relationship building.

Teachable Moment

Additionally, the result of the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience by serving as a teachable moment contributes to the research of self-disclosure in mentoring. During the field experience, mentors take advantage of situations and self-disclose their experiences or tell stories through which they help PSTs learn the professional and technical aspects of teaching by explaining assignments or providing live examples.

Although the majority but not all previous studies were conducted to examine supervisor-supervisee self-disclosure in clinical settings, and the current study was conducted to examine

the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, it would be unacceptable to generalize the findings from the previous studies. However, since some of the previous studies were conducted in a similar setting, and generated similar findings, it would be acceptable to extend the findings from the previous studies and conclude that mentor-mentee self-disclosure enhances PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience. Moreover, self-disclosure and social interaction seem connected and required to establish a mentor-mentee relationship through which the PSTs' learning occurs.

Self-Disclosure and Mentoring Relationship Development

The findings indicated that the mentor-mentee self-disclosure influenced the mentoring relationship development in the field experience by increasing the level of liking and closeness between the mentors and PSTs, and building mentoring relationships based on mutual trust and respect.

Closeness and Liking

Research of mentoring in teacher education argue that within mentoring relationships, the interaction between mentors and PSTs improves PSTs' knowledge and practice of teaching (Stanulis & Floden 2009). Mentoring relationship is a significant component of the field experience because "any expected results of beginning teachers' learning to teach professionally under the influences of mentoring in induction have to be realized through mentor-novice relationships with certain characteristics" (Wang & Odell, 2007, p 7). Nonetheless, what researchers mean by a good mentoring relationship and what leads to such relationship in the field experience is still unknown (Wang & Odell, 2007). Moreover, researchers (Harrison, Dymoke, & Pell, 2006) argued that PSTs preferred mentoring relationships on professional

development for few reasons including, modelling teaching, engaging PSTs in discussions, and offering feedback while allowing PSTs to realize the challenges that they were encountering.

Similarly, Lofstrom and Eisenschmidt (2009) noticed that PSTs preferred mentoring relationship which was based on mutual trust, in that mentors provided PSTs with strategies and feedback about their performance while concurrently allowed PSTs to follow their own personal and professional development.

The result of the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on increasing the level of closeness and liking between the mentors and PSTs in the field experience confirms the results from previous studies (Collins & Miller, 1994; Dindia, 2002; Laurenceau et al., 1998; Sprecher, Treger, & Wondra, 2012; Sprecher et al., 2013; Wrench & Punyanunt, 2004) as they claimed that people disclose more to whom they like, people like more who disclose to them, and people like more to whom they have disclosed personal information. The result in the current study suggests that mentor-mentee self-disclosure raises the likelihood of closeness and liking between the mentors and PSTs which are vital for establishing mentoring relationships in the field experience.

Trust and Respect

The result of the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on creating trust and respect between the mentors and PSTs in the field experience confirms the results from previous studies (Hudson, 2013; Knox et al., 2011; Ladany et al., 2003; Monsour & Corman, 1991) in that the supervisor-supervisee self-disclosure of experiences, information, and resources led to creating trust and respect, and consequently set the foundations of relationship development between the supervisors and supervisees. The result in the current study suggests that mentor-mentee self-

disclosure is a functional tool that can be used to establish mentoring relationships based on trust and respect.

Contribution to Theory

Social Penetration Theory

Social penetration theory (SPT), originated by Altman and Taylor (1973), was built on the dyadic and reciprocal relationships in interpersonal communication. The theory refers to the development of communication during the course of relationship development from being shallow to being deep. Social penetration theory states that people engage in a reciprocal process of self-disclosure as they are in the process of knowing each other. This process changes in breadth and depth, and impacts the relationship development. Breadth refers to the variety of subjects discussed. Depth, however, refers to how sensitive or personal the disclosed information is, and consists of three layers, including the peripheral layer, the intermediate layer, and the central layer. While, the peripheral layer includes biographical information, the intermediate layer includes personal opinions, beliefs and attitudes. The central layer, on the other hand, includes moral values, self-concepts and fears (Greene et al., 2006).

Altman and Taylor explained the role self-disclosure plays in interpersonal communication by examining four stages of relational development (orientation, exploratory affective exchange, affective exchange, and stable exchange). During the first stage, individuals only share superficial information; during the second stage, individuals reveal information that may not be revealed during the orientation stage; during the third stage, individuals drop their personal shields and reveal more to and learn more from each other; during the final stage, individuals continue their openness to each other.

Social penetration theory helps understand the relationship development between the mentors and preservice teachers during the field experience through its four stages, and draws attention to the importance of informal communication in establishing trusting relationships, and creating positive learning environments where both the mentors and preservice teachers can share their experiences and learn from each other. To establish an effective mentoring relationship in the field experience, interpersonal communication penetrates through these four stages, and allow both the mentor and preservice teacher to open up to each other, and thus, exchange constructive experiences and feedback. By mentoring preservice teachers, the mentors establish relationships with preservice teachers that not only benefit the preservice teachers personally and professionally but also model the mentorship. Furthermore, exchanging disclosures allows the mentors to learn more about their preservice teachers' personal lives while disclosing their personal experiences, and thus enhances the mentoring process. In addition, the more self-disclosure the mentor and preservice teacher exchange leads to the more liking, closeness and similarities. This may help the mentor and preservice teacher establish and maintain a positive relationship that allows them to share experiences, knowledge and feedback, and consequently enhance learning and professional development. On the other hand, the less self-disclosure the mentor and preservice teacher exchange leads to the less liking, closeness and similarities. Thus, the mentoring relationship may deteriorate or diminish which may lead to less sharing of experiences, knowledge and feedback, and may negatively influence the preservice teachers' learning to teach.

Following this theory, I explored the effects of self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship development and PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. In terms of research design, data collection and data analysis, the concepts of SPT guided my interview

questions and allowed me “to enter into the other person’s perspective” (Patton, 2002, p. 341) to understand the phenomenon (the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in field experience) from both the mentors’ and preservice teachers’ perspectives (Falk & Blumenreich, 2005). See Appendices (A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³, C and D). Also, SPT theory contributed to answering research questions (1 and 3).

This study expanded the functionality of social penetration theory in the context of the field experience of teacher education by examining the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on mentoring relationship development and PSTs’ learning to teach. The topics and purposes of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure were tested through SPT concepts (depth and breadth), and eventually new venues were developed. For example, the participants’ interpersonal communication penetrated through the four relational stages of SPT, and allowed the participants to self-disclose professional experiences, fear, concern and confusions.

Moreover, this study promoted the feasibility of social and communication theories in general, and SPT in specific within the context of teacher education by highlighting the importance of informal communication in creating positive learning environments that allow both the mentor and PST to open up to each other, exchange constructive feedback and experiences, and consequently learn from each other. Also, by using self-disclosure as a teachable moment and informal curriculum in PSTs’ learning, this study redefined the concept of “depth” in SPT, and extended the scope of its three layers to professional settings (i.e. see professional topics).

Furthermore, this study specified how personal a mentor and preservice teacher should be in order to sustain a functional mentoring relationship in the field experience (i.e. Case 1 and 2). In addition, it redefined the concept of “intimacy” in SPT by identifying the topics and purposes

of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in order to keep the mentoring relationships professional in the field experience.

Nevertheless, the theory does not explain how mentors use their self-disclosure as a curriculum to provide PSTs with knowledge, strategies, advice and live examples. Accordingly, Minger (2004) revealed that “the incorporation of social penetration theory was not as appropriate in the instructional setting as it has been in interpersonal dyadic research” (p. 165). Therefore, Minger proposed “It is now time for future research to go beyond adopting and borrowing theories for instructional use to developing our own theories specific to the instructional context” (p. 165), and that “The development of future instructional theories should have the ultimate goal of explaining, predicting, and controlling for cognitive learning outcomes” (p. 165).

Contemporary research in psychology has focused on the significance of social activities, such as conversation, information sharing, debating, self-disclosure and discussion in the enhancement of learning (Wilson & Peterson, 2006). In this study, I argue that learning is a social activity, influenced by individual, cultural, contextual, and historical factors (Lewis, Encisco, & Moje, 2007; Wertsch, 1991). Because the mentors and PSTs work side by side, they constantly interact and exchange information. Another theory needs to examine this behavior considering the social as well as the educational aspects of such exchange of information.

Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory (SET) was built on the idea that people reason their relationships in economic ways (costs and rewards). Whereas costs refer to the negative sequences of a relationship, rewards refer to the positive sequences of a relationship. The theory argues that the exchanged behaviors in social relationships (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Homans, 1958) may

include “tangible or intangible” characteristics (Homans, 1958). Whereas tangible characteristics may include support and help, intangible characteristics may include agreement and respect.

According to Homans, individuals in such relationships evaluate the cost and benefit of participating with the other members, and tend to participate more when the profit is high, meanwhile they tend to withdraw when the profit is low (Blau, 1964).

Research has described the concept of mentoring as ‘both a relationship and a process’ (Kwan & Lopez, 2005, p.276), and as a dialogue (Heikkinen, Jokinen, & Tynjälä, 2008).

Bransford and colleagues (1999) defined mentoring as a multidimensional activity in which experienced teachers support new teachers’ progress through training and development. During the field experience, before the mentors and preservice teachers engage in mentoring relationships, they assess the costs and rewards of sharing personal and professional information. Mentors and preservice teachers share work-related successes, concerns, failures, and other personal and professional information. On the other hand, they may refrain from sharing devaluating experiences or sensitive information such as sexual orientation or criminal records. If the mentors and preservice teachers perceive the mentoring relationships as rewarding, they may engage in more self-disclosure. This will allow the mentoring relationships to strengthen, and consequently maximizes the preservice teachers’ chances to learn to teach (i.e. see Case 1). On the other hand, if the mentors and preservice teachers perceive the mentoring relationships as not rewarding or costing, they may engage in less self-disclosure. This will allow the mentoring relationship to deteriorate, and consequently minimizes the preservice teachers’ chances to learn to teach (i.e. see Case 2).

Maintaining personal and professional disclosures between the mentors and preservice teachers may welcome preservice teachers into teaching, and provide them with the needed

experiences and tools to survive the difficulties preservice teachers encounter in the beginning of their teaching career. According to Franke and Dahlgren (1996), this explains how mentor teachers succeed or fail in helping new teachers feel comfortable, and learn the practice and culture of teaching. Moreover, such disclosures may support the mentors' involvement in preservice teachers' difficulties as well as learning the ways preservice teachers use to overcome such difficulties.

Following this theory, I explored the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship development and preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience. In terms of research design, data collection and data analysis, the concepts of SET guided my interview questions and observation sessions, and allowed me to understand the factors and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience (See Appendices A¹, A², A³, B¹, B², B³, C and D). Also, SET theory contributed to answering the three research questions.

This study expanded SET in the context of the field experience of teacher education by examining the effects of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on mentoring relationship development and PSTs' learning to teach. The factors that influenced the mentors' and mentees' decisions to disclose or not to disclose were tested through the concepts of SET (reward and cost). Moreover, this study differentiated between what the mentors and PSTs perceived as valuable or as rewarding. For example, although the mentor teachers in the two cases knew that self-disclosing their failure experiences was not rewarding, they continued doing it.

Understanding the Mentor-Mentee Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

The topics of mentor-mentee self-disclosure are important elements in the socialization process for mentoring PSTs in the field experience. When a mentor and PST exchange

information, they engage in a social process that aims at building mentoring relationships through which PST's learning occurs. Moreover, this socialization process may involve a reciprocal exchange of information, experiences resources and support from both parties, which improves PST's teaching, and consequently education.

Considering the shift from student to teacher roles, PSTs need a place to relieve stress and anxiety, discuss personal or professional issues, and offer ideas in the classroom. At the beginning of mentoring, PSTs may feel unsafe and uncomfortable expressing their needs, struggles and concerns; if this continues, their expectations for the field experience will be unmet and their problems will remain unsolved. Mentors may try sharing their personal information to establish a more relaxing environment when mentees also share their personal information; however, not every team develops reciprocal sharing relationship (i.e. Case 2). Sharing personal information may enhance the relationship development between the mentors and mentees but the relationship is dependent on each party's personal attributes, mentors' mentoring philosophies, and PSTs' needs.

In addition to personal information, self-disclosure also involves professional information. For example, in a mentoring context, the mentor-mentee self-disclosure may serve as instructional tool to explain PSTs' assignments (Cayanus, 2004), and to provide PSTs with knowledge, strategies, advice and live examples. Therefore, the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience may serve as a curriculum or agenda for teaching as well as a socializing agent for communication and mentoring relationships building.

Implications for Theories, Practices and Future Research

The findings in this study provide several implications for theories (SPT and SET), practitioners of self-disclosure in the field experience, policy makers and practitioners of teacher education program, and research of mentoring in teacher education.

Implications for Theories

The concepts of social penetration theory and social exchange theory provided the framework upon which this study was built. Following these theories allowed me to explore the effects of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure on the mentoring relationship development and preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience. In terms of research design, and data collection and analysis, the concepts of SPT and SET guided my observation and interview questions, and allowed me "to enter into the other person's perspective" (Patton, 2002, p. 341) to understand the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in field experience from both the mentor' and PST' perspectives (Falk & Blumenreich, 2005). Furthermore, they allowed me to understand the motives of the mentors' and PSTs' self-disclosure in the field experience, and provided answers for my three research questions. Nevertheless, SPT and SET are relatively dated, and do not provide clear definitions for some of their major principles. Therefore, by collecting data through three different phases and via multiple sources, this study expanded these theories in the context of the field experience in teacher education. For instance, by applying the principles of SPT, the current study specified how personal a mentor and preservice teacher should be in order to sustain a functional mentoring relationship, and drew a limit of intimacy between the mentor and preservice teacher in order to keep their mentoring relationship professional. Additionally, this study provided a clear definition for SET major concepts (reward and cost), and differentiated between what could be perceived as valuable or as rewarding, which made it testable.

Implications for Practice in Teacher Education

First, the research participants voiced the importance of exchanging self-disclosure on mentoring relationship development and PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. The mentor-mentee self-disclosure exchange included personal and professional topics and purposes. Through personal self-disclosures, the participants self-disclosed information about family, religion, working experience, childhood, culture and personal problems to build a rapport. Through professional self-disclosure, the PST participants self-disclosed information related to content and pedagogy, and career development to receive feedback, strategies, relieve stress and anxiety, and understand the reality of teaching. This line of research will help the mentors and preservice teachers recognize the proper topics of their disclosures to communicate effectively, and consequently improve mentoring, and enhance teacher learning.

Second, several factors influenced the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience including, personal attributes, mentoring philosophy and preservice teacher's need. The significance of this line of research is three folds: 1) it will help mentors and PSTs improve and employ their personal qualities to build meaningful mentoring relationships and facilitate PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience; 2) It will help mentors reflect on their mentoring philosophies and learn how to use those philosophies to build mentoring relationships and improve PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience; and 3) It will help PSTs self-disclose their concerns and questions comfortably as well as allow mentor teachers relate to their STs' concerns and questions.

Third, mentor-mentee self-disclosure influenced PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience as it created a safe and comfortable learning environment, served as a hidden curriculum and a teachable moment. This line of research will help practitioners to consider

mentor-mentee self-disclosure as an informal curriculum in PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience. Also, mentor-mentee self-disclosure increased the level of closeness and liking and built mentoring relationships based on mutual trust and respect. Although increasing the level of closeness and liking and building mentoring relationships based on mutual trust and respect requires time and effort, but the outcomes are advantageous and necessary for successful learning experiences. This line of research will help mentors and PSTs build meaningful and functional mentoring relationships during the field experience.

The findings of this study also offer the basic knowledge base for program developers and policy makers in teacher education to create a functional mentoring program that enhances PSTs' learning to teach in the field experience. The field experience is a cornerstone in the preservice teachers' education as it familiarizes preservice teachers with the fundamental concepts of teaching and learning and allows them to observe and participate in varied educational settings. Moreover, preservice teachers are expected to listen, interview, observe, reflect, and match their theoretical and practical perspectives of teaching (Wilson, Floden & Ferrini-Mundy, 2002). The successful fulfillment of the coursework and field experience assignments is expected to transform student teachers into teachers and leaders. This requires the mentors to construct and reconstruct knowledge (Tang & Choi, 2007), and demonstrate skills in problem solving, collaboration, decision making, evaluation, and communication to support PSTs' learning to teach during the field experience (Gagen & Bowie, 2005; Graves, 2010). The mentor participants in this study reported having only one-day workshop training prior starting their mentoring duties. Therefore, providing mentors with feasible training on the proper use of the mentoring strategies and interpersonal and communication skills, and learning different

mentoring models and the outcomes of national and international PSTs mentoring programs would be advantageous.

Limitations

Identifying the limitations in research design is critical. Thus, the findings in this study offer few limitations. One limitation of this multiple case study is the participant selection procedure. The selection of the mentor participants was based on recommendations from the school administration. Meanwhile, the selection of the preservice teacher participants was associated with the selection of their mentor teachers. To avoid any possible bias in data, the participants should have been selected randomly and not based on recommendations. Since it is not the case in the current study, the generalizability of the research findings may be affected (Schloss & Smith, 1999). Nonetheless, collecting data through three different phases and via triangulate data sources enhanced the trustworthiness and validity of data (Miller, 2007; Yin, 2003).

Another concern is the selected site. Although data was collected through three different phases and via multiple sources such as direct observations, and individual and group interviews, data was collected at one school site and for one academic level (high school). Thus, future research should examine and compare how mentor-mentee self-disclosure is perceived and utilized at multiple school sites and academic levels.

Validity and trustworthiness are major concerns for the data analysis in multiple case studies (Kohn, 1997). Although the validity of data analysis was controlled by using the replication methods in analyzing the collected data, the trustworthiness of data analysis could be established by allowing another researcher to code random parts of the transcripts, and then comparing all transcribed transcripts to enhance inter-coder trustworthiness.

Moreover, although it was unlikely for the study participants to suffer any considerable anxiety or stress from this study, the methods used for data collection and analysis were time-consuming for the mentors and PSTs; thus fatigue effects may occur (Lester, 1999).

Finally, based on the nature of this multiple case study including, school site, academic level and number of research participants, the findings from this study may limit the research from investigating self-disclosure more broadly.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this multiple case study contribute to the research of mentoring in teacher education in three ways. First, this study added to the research of self-disclosure in mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach in the field experience. Second, it developed a theoretical understanding of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience. Third, this study shed light on the further investigation of research and theoretical framework of self-disclosure in the field of teacher education. Several aspects of self-disclosure in the field experience need to be investigated:

1. The academic level in this study was restricted to secondary education; specifically, teachers of ninth and tenth grades. Extending the research scope into middle and preschool levels is recommended for further investigation of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience.
2. Although this study involved multiple cases, it was conducted at one research site. Future research should be conducted at multiple research sites.
3. Self-disclosure raised the likelihood of liking and closeness between the mentors and PSTs, and set the foundations for building mentoring relationships based on mutual trust

and respect. Future research should further examine the effects of self-disclosure on liking, closeness, trust and respect when combined with the content of disclosure.

4. Mentor-mentee natural conversations involved both sides of disclosure, which allowed the mentor; for example, to concurrently learn about the PST while allowed the PST to learn more about the mentor. Future research should focus on studying spontaneous conversations rather than simulating questions when examining mentor-mentee self-disclosure.
5. Future research should also consider the effects of cultural, ethnic and gender factors on the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience.
6. Research in inappropriate self-disclosure should be investigated to more fully understand the nature of self-disclosure and its effects on mentoring and learning to teach.

Summary

The purpose of Chapter Five was to discuss the findings of the current study. The chapter provided a general overview of the previous chapters focusing on Chapter Three (methodology). The chapter also provided a summary of the major findings followed by the discussion section explaining the findings in relation to the theoretical framework and literature mentioned in the previous chapters. Furthermore, this chapter offered implications, limitations of the current study, recommendations for future studies, and a summary for the data collected and analyzed. Finally, Chapter Five drew a final conclusion for this dissertation.

Conclusion

The purpose of this multiple case study was to examine the mentor-mentee self-disclosure as an approach of informal communication and its effects on the mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach during the field experience. In order to

understand the mentor-mentee self-disclosure and its use in the field experience, the researcher attempted to answer the following research questions: 1) what are the topics of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience? 2) What are the factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience? 3) How do mentors and preservice teachers use self-disclosure as a tool to enhance the mentoring relationships and preservice teachers' learning to teach? The findings were reported based on the three themes that are related to research questions: topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, factors that influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience, and impact of mentor-mentee self-disclosure on preservice teachers' learning to teach and mentoring relationship during the field experience.

On one hand, topics and purposes of mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience involved the mentors and PSTs in the two cases self-disclosing their personal and professional information during the field experience. Unlike the other research participants, Gallardo abstained from self-disclosing his personal information to Ms. Kate because, according to him, it was "pointless" as she shut him down. This finding was not consistent among the participants in the two cases, but for anticipated causes; therefore, theoretical replication was attained (Yin, 1994). Moreover, factors such as personal attributes, mentoring philosophy and ST's need influence the social exchange of the mentor-mentee self-disclosure in the field experience. This finding was consistent among the participants in the two cases; therefore, literal replication was attained (Yin, 1994).

Furthermore, mentor-mentee self-disclosure created a safe learning environment, served as a hidden curriculum and as a teachable moment. This finding was consistent among the participants in the two case studies; therefore, literal replication was attained (Yin, 1994).

Additionally, mentor-mentee self-disclosure raised the likelihood of liking and closeness between the mentors and PSTs, and set the foundations for building mentoring relationships based on mutual trust and respect. This finding was consistent among the participants in the two case studies; therefore, literal replication was attained (Yin, 1994).

APPENDIX (A¹): MENTORS' FIRST INTERVIEW

Individual Interview Protocol

Mentor's name: _____ (code) _____

School: _____

Time of interview: _____ AM/ PM

Date of interview: _____

Questions:

Thank you for signing the consent form. I'm going to ask you questions regarding the field experience. The interview will take 20-25 minutes, and there is no right or wrong answers for the questions. You can withdraw from the interview and study anytime you want.

- Tell me about your educational background and working experiences.
- What type of information do you share with your PST? Can you provide an example?
How often do you share such information? Why? What information do you think he/she should not share with you? Why?
- Between you and your mentee, who initiated sharing personal information? Why?
- Why do you share your personal information with your mentee?
- Please describe the mentoring relationship you are involved in with your PST. How does sharing of information affect the mentoring relationship building?
- What challenges do you face while dealing with your PST? Do share such challenges with him/ her?
- What types of concerns does your mentee share with you about teaching? What does he/she share? In what ways does he/she share them with you?

Appendix (A¹) continued

- Why do you share your professional information with your mentee?
- Would you like to share or add any further information?

APPENDIX (A²): MENTORS' SECOND INTERVIEW

Individual Interview Protocol

Mentor's name: _____ (code) _____

School: _____

Time of interview: _____ AM/ PM

Date of interview: _____

Questions:

Thank you for signing the consent form. I'm going to ask you questions regarding the field experience. The interview will take 20-25 minutes, and there is no right or wrong answers for the questions. You can withdraw from the interview and study anytime you want.

- Do you dictate limits to what you share with your ST? Do you usually hesitate to open up to him/ her? Why? Were you open to share with your previous mentees? To what degree? Why?
- To what extent do you feel comfortable sharing personal or professional information with your ST? How can you tell that your ST feel comfortable sharing information with you? Can you give me an example?
- What type of professional information do you share with your ST? Why?
- What are the aspects that influence the communication level between you and your ST? Can you give an example?
- Why do your STs share personal or professional information with you?
- How does sharing personal information influence the relationship between you and your mentee?
- How does the information your mentee share with you enhance you mentoring?

Appendix (A²) continued

- How does your way of communication with your mentee reflect your mentoring style?
- What makes you decide to open up and share personal or professional information with your ST?

APPENDIX (A³): MENTORS' THIRD INTERVIEW

Individual Interview Protocol

Mentor's name: _____ (code) _____

School: _____

Time of interview: _____ AM/ PM

Date of interview: _____

Questions:

Thank you for signing the consent form. I'm going to ask you questions regarding the field experience. The interview will take 20-25 minutes, and there is no right or wrong answers for the questions. You can withdraw from the interview and study anytime you want.

- To what extent do you feel comfortable sharing personal or professional information with your ST? Why? How can you tell that your ST feels comfortable sharing information with you? Can you give me an example?
- What are the characteristics of a functional mentoring relationship? What are the characteristics of a successful mentor?
- How does sharing personal or professional information influence relationship building with your ST during this field experience?
- How does sharing personal or professional information influence your ST's learning to teach during this field experience? Can you give me an example?
- How does sharing information help your ST succeed as a new teacher? Can you give me an example?
- How do you use information sharing in STs' learning to teach? Can you give me an example?

Appendix (A³) continued

- What are the mentee's expectations and needs of mentoring process? Before and after?
- What challenges does your mentee face while teaching? How do you help him/ her overcome such challenges?

APPENDIX (B¹): PRESERVICE TEACHERS' FIRST INTERVIEW

Individual Interview Protocol

Preservice teacher's name: _____ (code) _____

School: _____

Time of interview: _____ AM/ PM

Date of interview: _____

Questions:

Thank you for signing the consent form. I'm going to ask you questions regarding the field experience. The interview will take 20-25 minutes, and there is no right or wrong answers for the questions. You can withdraw from the interview and study anytime you want.

- Tell me about your educational background and working experiences.
- What type of information do you share with your mentor? How often do you share such information? Why? Can you provide an example?
- Between you and your mentor, who initiated sharing personal information? Why?
- Why do you share your personal information with your mentor?
- Please describe the mentoring relationship you are involved in with your mentor. How does sharing of information affect the mentoring relationship building?
- What challenges do you face while dealing with your mentor? Do share such challenges with him/ her?
- Do you share professional information or teaching concerns with your mentor? How often do you share such information?
- Why do you share your professional information with your mentor?

Appendix (B¹) continued

- Does your mentor mention his/ her experiences learning to teach? How often? How does it help you as a new teacher?
- Would you like to share or add any further information?

APPENDIX (B²): PRESERVICE TEACHERS' SECOND INTERVIEW

Individual Interview Protocol

Preservice teacher's name: _____ (code) _____

School: _____

Time of interview: _____ AM/ PM

Date of interview: _____

Questions:

Thank you for signing the consent form. I'm going to ask you questions regarding the field experience. The interview will take 20-25 minutes, and there is no right or wrong answers for the questions. You can withdraw from the interview and study anytime you want.

- To what extent do you feel comfortable sharing personal or professional information with your mentor? How can you tell that your mentor feel comfortable sharing information with you? Can you give me an example?
- Do you dictate limits to what you share with your mentor? Do you usually hesitate to open up to him/ her? Why?
- What type of professional information do you share with your mentor? Why?
- What are the aspects that influence the communication level between you and your mentor? Can you give an example?
- Why does your mentor share personal or professional information with you?
- How does sharing personal information influence the relationship between you and your mentor?

Appendix (B²) continued

- What makes you decide to open up and share personal or professional information with your mentor? What makes you decide to share or not share such information with your mentor?
- How does your mentor's way of communicating with you reflect his/ her mentoring style?

APPENDIX (B³): PRESERVICE TEACHERS' THIRD INTERVIEW

Individual Interview Protocol

Preservice teacher's name: _____ (code) _____

School: _____

Time of interview: _____ AM/ PM

Date of interview: _____

Questions:

Thank you for signing the consent form. I'm going to ask you questions regarding the field experience. The interview will take 20-25 minutes, and there is no right or wrong answers for the questions. You can withdraw from the interview and study anytime you want.

- To what extent do you feel comfortable sharing personal or professional information with your ST? Why? How can you tell that your ST feels comfortable sharing information with you? Can you give me an example?
- What are the characteristics of a functional mentoring relationship? What are the characteristics of a successful mentor?
- How does sharing personal or professional information influence relationship building with your ST during this field experience?
- How does sharing personal or professional information influence your ST's learning to teach during this field experience? Can you give me an example?
- How does sharing information help your ST succeed as a new teacher? Can you give me an example?
- How do you use information sharing in STs' learning to teach? Can you give me an example?

Appendix (B³) continued

- What are the mentee's expectations and needs of mentoring process? Before and after?
- What challenges does your mentee face while teaching? How do you help him/ her overcome such challenges?

APPENDIX (C): OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

Classroom Observation Protocol

School: _____

Mentor Observed: _____ (code) _____

Preservice Teacher Observed: _____ (code) _____

Date and Time of Observation: _____

Observer Checklist for Verbal Communication

Sharing professional information	Example	Coding number	Decoding score
first year teaching experience			
successes/ failures			
Concerns, struggles and difficulties.			
experiences and situations similar to the ones the preservice teacher is facing			
Sharing common interests			
providing feedback			
Providing motivation			
Sharing personal information	Example	Code number	Decoding score
Mood			
Family			
Hobby			
Relationship			
Mood			
Others	Example	Code number	Decoding Score
Inappropriate sharing			
External Factors (interruptions)			

Observer Checklist for Nonverbal Communication

IMMEDIACY (High amounts = involvement)

____ Eye contact

____ Direct body orientation (facing directly)

____ Getting physically close

EXPRESSIVENESS (High amounts = involvement)

____ Facial expressions of emotion

____ Vocal expressions of emotion

____ Laughing

ENGAGEMENT (High amounts = involvement)

____ Talking (floor holding)

____ Positive nonverbal responses (head nods, smiles, “uh huhs,” etc.)

____ Gesture

COMPOSURE

____ Nervous mannerisms

____ Self-touching

____ Rigid/stiff posture

(Taken from Jones, T. S., & Brinkert, R. (2007). *Conflict coaching: Conflict management strategies and skills for the individual*. Sage Publications).

APPENDIX (D): FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW

Group Interview Protocol

School: _____

Number of mentors participating in the group interview: _____

Number of preservice teachers participating in the group interview: _____

Time of interview: _____ AM PM

Date of interview: _____

Questions:

Thank you for signing the consent form. I'm going to ask you questions regarding the field experience. The interview will take 15-20 minutes, and there is no right or wrong answers for the questions. You can withdraw from the interview and study anytime you want.

- How do you think preservice teachers learn best?
- What factors influence the communication level between preservice teachers and their mentor teachers?
- Why do you share personal information with your mentors/ PSTs? Why do you share professional information with your mentors/ PSTs?
- How does sharing personal and professional information help preservice teachers succeed as a new teacher?
- How do mentors use information sharing in PSTs' learning?
- How does sharing personal information influence the relationship between preservice teachers and their mentors?

Appendix (D) Continued

- What are the characteristics or the ingredients of a good mentorship relationship? What characteristics should be available in the mentor and preservice teacher to establish such a mentoring relationship?
- What are your expectations and needs of the mentoring process? Before and after?
- What challenges do preservice teachers face while teaching? What challenges do preservice teachers face while dealing with their mentors? How do the mentors help their preservice teachers overcome such challenges?

APPENDIX (E): APPROVAL TO USE A TABLE

Dear Dr. Ehrich,

Thanks for emailing me back and clearing the issue out. Actually, I'm planning to combine the three tables of (categories and frequencies for positive outcomes) for the mentor, mentee and organization in one table. I hope you give me the permission to do that, promising to cite the generated table as follows: (Taken from Hansford, B. C., Tennent, L. & Ehrich, L. C. (2003). Educational mentoring: Is it worth the effort? *Education Research and Perspectives*, 39(1), pp. 42–75. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00002259/>).

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely Yours;

Khaled I Alnajjar

abedalra@unlv.nevada.edu

[702-742-5171](tel:702-742-5171)

Dear Khaled

You have my permission to use tables from our qut eprint paper entitled, “Educational mentoring: is it worth the effort”.

Kind regards

Lisa

A/Prof Lisa Catherine Ehrich

School of Cultural and Professional Learning | Faculty of Education | A Block

Appendix E (continued)

Queensland University of Technology | Kelvin Grove Campus | Victoria Park Road | QLD |
Australia | 4059

tel: +61 7 3138 3038 | fax: +61 7 3138 3987 | email: lehrich@qut.edu.au

Profile: <http://staff.qut.edu.au/staff/ehrich/>

CRICOS No. 00213J.

APPENDIX (F) IRB APPROVAL FORM



**Social/Behavioral IRB – Exempt Review
Deemed Exempt**

DATE: February 9, 2015

TO: **Dr. Shaoan Zhang**, Teaching and Learning

FROM: Office of Research Integrity – Human Subjects

RE: Notification of IRB Action
Protocol Title: Learning to Teach Through School-Based Mentoring
Protocol # 1501-5050M

This memorandum is notification that the project referenced above has been reviewed as indicated in
Federal regulatory statutes 45CFR46 and deemed exempt under 45 CFR 46.101(b)2.

PLEASE NOTE:

Upon Approval, the research team is responsible for conducting the research as stated in the exempt application reviewed by the ORI – HS and/or the IRB which shall include using the most recently submitted Informed Consent/Assent Forms (Information Sheet) and recruitment materials. The official versions of these forms are indicated by footer which contains the date exempted.

*Any changes to the application may cause this project to require a different level of IRB review. Should any changes need to be made, please submit a **Modification Form**. When the above referenced project has been completed, please submit a **Continuing Review/Progress Completion report** to notify ORI – HS of its closure.*

If you have questions or require any assistance, please contact the Office of Research Integrity - Human Subjects at IRB@unlv.edu or call (702) 895-2794.

REFERENCES

- Altman, I., & Talyor, D. (1973). Social penetration: *The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ambrosetti, A. & Dekkers, J. (2010). The interconnectedness of the roles of mentors and mentees in pre-service teacher education mentoring relationships. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 42-55.
- Anzul, J. C. (2000). Teacher team develops a district mentoring program. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 36(2), 65-67.
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research (9th ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The qualitative report*, 13(4), 544-559.
- Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Components of a good practicum placement: Student teacher perceptions. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 81-98.
- Benbasat, I., Goldstein, D. K., & Mead, M. (1987). The case research strategy in studies of information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 11(3), 369-386.
- Berg, J. H. (1987). Responsiveness and self-disclosure. In V. J. Derlega & J. H. Berg (Eds.), *Self-disclosure: Theory, research, and therapy* (pp. 101-130). New York: Plenum.
- Berg, J. H. & Derlega, V.J. (1987). Themes in the study of self-disclosure. In V. J. Derlega & J. H. Berg (Eds.), *Self-disclosure: Theory, research and therapy* (pp. 1-8). New York: Plenum.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Bradbury, L. U., & Koballa, T. R., Jr. (2008). Borders to cross: Identifying sources of tension in mentor-intern relationships. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 24(8), 2132-2145.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Bromley, D. B. (1990). Academic contributions to psychological counselling: I. A philosophy of science for the study of individual cases. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 3(3), 299-307.
- Butler, B. M., & Cuenca, A. (2012). Conceptualizing the roles of mentor teachers during student teaching. *Action in Teacher education*, 34(4), 296-308.
- Campbell, M. R., & Brummett, V. M. (2007). Mentoring preservice teachers for development and growth of professional knowledge. *Music Educators Journal*, 93(3), 50-55.
- Carver, C. (2009) Using policy to improve teacher induction: Critical elements and missing pieces. *Educational Policy*, 23(2), 295-328.
- Cayanus, J. L. (2004). Effective instructional practice: Using teacher self-disclosure as an instructional tool. *Communication Teacher*, 18(1), 6-9.
- Cayanus, J. L., Martin, M. M., & Goodboy, A. K. (2009). The relation between teacher self-disclosure and student motives to communicate. *Communication Research Reports*, 26(2), 105-113.
- Center, N. T. (2002). Continuum of teacher development. Santa Cruz, CA.
- Chaudoir, S. R., & Fisher, J. D. (2010). The disclosure processes model: Understanding disclosure decision-making and post-disclosure outcomes among people living with concealable stigmatized identity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(2), 236-256.

- Cherian, F. (2007). Learning to teach: Teacher candidates reflect on the relational, conceptual, and contextual influences of responsive mentorship. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(1), 25-46.
- Christ, S. (2004). Examining learning to teach through a social lens: How mentors guide newcomers into a professional community of learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 7-24.
- Clarke, A., Collins, J., Triggs, V., Nielsen, W., Augustine, A., Coulter, D., ... & Weil, F. (2012). The mentoring profile inventory: An online professional development resource for cooperating teachers. *Teaching Education*, 23(2), 167-194.
- Clutterbuck, D., & London Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (2004). Everyone needs a mentor: *Fostering talent in your organization* (pp. 15-19). London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Collins, N., & Miller, L. C. (1994). Self-disclosure and liking: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(3), 457-475. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.457.
- Cornbleth, C. (1990). *Curriculum in context*. London and New York: Falmer.
- Cozby, P. C. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 79, 73-91.
- Cozby, P.D. (1972). Self-disclosure, reciprocity and liking. *Sociometry*, 35, 151-160.
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Critelli, J. W., & Neumann, K. F. (2002). An interpersonal analysis of self-disclosure and feedback. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 6(2), 173-177.
- Cropanzano, R & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874-900.

- Culbert, S. A. (1968). Interpersonal process of self-disclosure: It takes two to see one. *Explanation in Applied Science*. Washington: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.
- Danin, R., & Bacon, M.A. (1999). What teachers like (and don't like) about mandated induction programs. In M. Scherer (Ed.), *A better beginning: Supporting and mentoring new teachers* (pp. 202-209). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco, CA; Jossey-Bass.
- Deakins, D., Graham, L., Sullivan, R., & Whittam, G. (1998). New venture support: an analysis of mentoring support for new and early stage entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 5(2), 151-61.
- Denning, S. (2005). *The leader's guide to storytelling: Mastering the art and discipline of business narrative*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Derlega, V. J., & Grzelak, J. (1979). Appropriateness of self-disclosure in social relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 33, 102-115.
- Dindia, K. (2002). Self-disclosure research: Knowledge through meta-analysis. In M. Allen, R. W. Preiss, B. M. Gayle, & N. A. Burrell (Eds.), *Interpersonal Communication Research: Advances through meta-analysis*, (pp.169-185). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dougherty, T. W., & Dreher, G. F. (2007). Mentoring and career outcomes. *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice*, (pp. 51-93). Los Angeles: Sage

- Downs, V. C., Javidi, M., & Nussbaum, J. F. (1988). An analysis of teachers' verbal communication within the college classroom: Use of humor, self-disclosure, and narratives. *Communication Education*, 37, 127-140.
- Drury, C. G. (1995). Methods for direct observation of performance. *Evaluation of human work*, 2, 45-68.
- Eby, L. T., & Lockwood, A. (2005). Protégés' and mentors' reactions to participating in formal mentoring programs: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(3), 441-458.
- Ensher, E.A., Thomas, C. & Murphy, S.E. (2001). Comparison of traditional, step-ahead, and peer mentoring on protégés' support, satisfaction, and perceptions of career success: a social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15, 419-438.
- Ensher, E. A., & Murphy, S. E. (2005). *Power mentoring: How successful mentors and protégés get the most out of their relationships*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fagenson-Eland, E. A., Marks, M. A., & Amendola, K. L. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(1), 29-42.
- Falk, B., & Blumenreich, M. (2005). *The power of questions: A guide to teacher and student research*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Farber, P., Wilson, P., & Holm, G. (1989). From innocence to inquiry: A social reproduction framework. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(1), 45-50.
- Fletcher, J. K. & Ragins, B. R. (2007). Stone Center Relational Cultural Theory: A window on relational mentoring. In B. R. Ragins and K. E. Kram (Eds.) *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 373-399). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Franke, A., & Dahlgren, L. (1996). Conceptions of mentoring: An empirical study of conceptions of mentoring during the school-based teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12, 627-641.
- Gagen, L., & Bowie, S. (2005). Effective mentoring: A case for training mentors for novice teachers. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 76(7), 40-45.
- Gallego, M. A. (2001). Is experience the best teacher? The potential of coupling classroom and community-based field experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(4), 312-325.
- Gibb, G. S., & Welch, M. (1998). The Utah mentor teacher academy: Evaluation of a statewide mentor program. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 21(1), 22-33.
- Glenn, W. (2006). Model versus mentor: Defining the necessary qualities of the effective cooperating teacher. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(1), 85-95.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: a preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Gravells, J. (2006). Mentoring start-up entrepreneurs in the East Midlands – troubleshooters and trusted friends. *The International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching*, 4(2), 20-1.
- Graves, S. (2010). Mentoring pre-service teachers: A case study. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 35(4), 14-20.
- Greene, K., Derlega, V. J., & Mathews, A. (2006). Self-disclosure in personal relationships. relationships. In A. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of personal relationships*, (pp. 409-427). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Gregory, L. D. (2005). *Influence in the classroom: Exploring instructor self-disclosive communication and student outcomes in higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, Coral Gables.
- Hansford, B. C., Tennent, L. & Ehrich, L. C. (2003). Educational mentoring: Is it worth the effort? *Education Research and Perspectives*, 39(1), 42-75.
<http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00002259/>
- Harper, V. B., & Harper, E. J. (2006). Understanding student self-disclosure typology through blogging. *The Qualitative Report*, 11(2), 251-261.
- Harris, S.M., Dersch, C.A. & Mittal, M. (1999). Look who's talking: Measuring self-disclosure in MFT. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 21, 405-412.
- Harrison, J., Dymoke, S., & Pell, T. (2006). Mentoring beginning teachers in secondary schools: An analysis of practice. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 22(8), 1055-1067.
- Heikkinen, H. L. T., Jokinen, H., & Tynjälä, P. (2008). Reconceptualising mentoring as a dialogue. In G. Fransson, & C. Gustafsson (Eds.), *Newly Qualified Teachers in Northern Europe: Comparative perspectives on promoting professional development*, (pp. 107-124). Gävle: University of Gävle.
- Hellsten, L.-a. M., Prytula, M. P., Ebanks, A., & Lai, H. (2009). Teacher induction: Exploring beginning teacher mentorship. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 32(4), 703-733.
- Hess, S.A., Knox, S., Schultz, J.M., Hill, C.E., Sloan, L., Brandt, S., Ignatius, E. & Kokonen, M. (2007). Factors contributing to verbal self-disclosure. *Nordic Psychology*, 59(4), 362-391.
- Hess, Shirley, Knox, Sarah, Schultz, Jill, Hill, Clara E., Sloan, Lea, Hoffman, M.A., Brandt, Susan, & Kelley, Frances, (2008). Predoctoral interns' nondisclosure in supervision. *Psychotherapy Research*, 18(4), 400-411.

- Hill, S. E. K., Bahniuk, M. H., & Dobos, J. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information adequacy, and communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, 38, 15-33.
doi: 10.1080/03634528909378737
- Holladay, S. J. (1984). *Student and teacher perception of teacher self-disclosure*. An unpublished manuscript, University of Oklahoma.
- Homans, G.C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597-606.
- Hudson, P. B. (2013a). Desirable attributes and practices for mentees: mentor teachers' expectations. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 2(3), 107-118.
- Hudson, P. (2013b). Developing and sustaining successful mentoring relationships. *Journal of Relationships Research*, 4, 10. e1 doi:10.1017/jrr.2013.1.
- Hurst, B. & Reding, G. (2002). *Teachers mentoring teachers*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- James, J. H. (2009). Reframing the disclosure debate: confronting issues of transparency in teaching controversial content. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 4(1), 82-94.
- Javidi, M. N., & Long, L. W. (1989). Teacher' use of humor, self-disclosure, and narrative activity as a function of experience. *Communication Research Reports*, 6(1), 47-52.
- Johnson, J. C. (1990). *Selecting ethnographic informants*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jones, M. (2001). Mentors' perceptions of their roles in school-based teacher training in England and Germany. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy*, 27(1), 75-94.

- Jones, T. S., & Brinkert, R. (2008). *Conflict coaching: Conflict management strategies and skills for the individual*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jourard, S. M. (1971). *Self-disclosure: The experimental investigation of the transparent self*. New York: John Wiley.
- Keller, T. E. (2005). The stages and development of mentoring relationships. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 82-99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kilburg, G. M. (2007). Three mentoring team relationships and obstacles encountered: a school-based case study. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 15(3), 293-308.
- Knox, S., Edwards, L. M., Hess, S. A., & Hill, C. E. (2011). Supervisor self-disclosure: Supervisees' experiences and perspectives. *Psychotherapy*, 48(4), 336-341.
- Kohn LT. (1997). *Methods in case study analysis* (Technical publication No. 2). Washington: The Center for Studying Health System Change.
- Ladany, N., & Walker, J.A. (2003). Supervisor self-disclosure: Balancing the uncontrollable narcissist with the indomitable altruist. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 59, 611-621. doi:10.1002/jclp.10164.
- Ladany, N., & Lehrman-Waterman, D. E. (1999). The content and frequency of supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the supervisory working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 38(3), 143-160.
- Lai, E. (2005). In-service teachers' perceptions of teaching practice mentoring. *International Journal of Learning*, 12(6), 107-113.

- Lampert, M., Franke, M. L., Kazemi, E., Ghouseini, H., Turrou, A. C., Beasley, H., ... & Crowe, K. (2013). Keeping it complex using rehearsals to support novice teacher learning of ambitious teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(3), 226-243.
- Laurenceau, J., Barrett, L. F., & Pietromonaco, P. R. (1998). Intimacy as an interpersonal process: The importance of self-disclosure, partner disclosure, and perceived partner responsiveness in interpersonal exchanges. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5), 1238-1251.
- Lawley, J. J., Moore, J., & Smajic, A. (2014). Effective communication between preservice and cooperating teachers. *The New Educator*, 10(2), 153-162.
doi:10.1080/1547688X.2014.898495
- Lester, S. (1999). *An introduction to phenomenological research*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.devmts.demon.co.uk/resmethy.htm>
- Lewis, C., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency and power*. Mahwah, NK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lidstone, M. L., & Ammon, P. (2002). A key to successful teaching is understanding and focusing on student learning: Implications for teacher development. *ERS Spectrum*, 20(4), 27-37.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods*. (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Lofstrom, E., & Eisenschmidt, E. (2009). Novice teachers' perspectives on mentoring: The case of the Estonian induction year. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 681-689.
- Lopez-Real, F., & Kwan, T. (2005). Mentors' perceptions of their own professional development during mentoring. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 31(1), 15-24.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mauer, E., & Zimmerman, E. (2000). Mentoring New Teachers. *Principal*, 79(3), 26-28.
- Maynard, T. (2000). Learning to teach or learning to manage mentors? Experiences of school-based teacher training. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 8(1), 17-30.
- McGee, C. D. (2001). Calming fears and building confidence: a mentoring process that works. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 9(3), 201-209.
- McGill, I., & Brockbank, A. (2004). *The action learning handbook: Powerful techniques for education, professional development and training*. London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Miller, L. C., Berg, J. H. & Archer, R. L. (1983). Openers: individuals who elicit intimate self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(6), 1234-44.
- Miller, V. D., & Jablin, F. M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 92-120.
- Minger, S. R. (2004). *Student empowerment and learning within the instructor-student relationship: Student outcomes mediated by instructor self-disclosure, perceived instructor caring, and relational solidarity*. Asbury Theological Seminary.

- Moir, E. (2009). Accelerating teacher effectiveness: Lessons learned from two decades of new teacher induction. *Kappan*, 91(2), 14-19.
- Moir, E., Barlin, D., Gless, J., & Miles, J. (2009). *New teacher mentoring: Hopes and promise for improving teacher effectiveness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Molm, L.D. (2003). Theoretical comparisons of forms of exchange. *Sociological Theory*, 21, 1-17.
- Molm, L.D., Takahashi, N. & Peterson, G. (2000). Risk and trust in social exchange: an experimental test of a classical proposition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 1396-1427.
- Monsour, M., & Corman (1991). Social and task functions of the dissertation partner: One way of avoiding terminal ABD status. *Communication Education*, 40(2), 180-186.
doi:10.1080/03634529109378839
- Morrison, E. W. (1993). Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 557-589.
- Mullen, E. J. (1998). Vocational and psychosocial mentoring functions: identifying mentors who serve both. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(4), 319-331.
- Newman, E. & G. Ingram (1989) *The Youth Work Curriculum*. London: Further Education Unit (FEU).
- Nieto, S. (2009). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a New Century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- O'Brien, P., & Goddard, R. (2006). Beginning teachers: Easing the transition to the classroom. *Australian Educational Leader*, 28(1), 28-31.

- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2005). A typology of errors and myths perpetuated in educational research textbooks. *Current Issues in Education*, 8(7). Retrieved from <http://cie.ed.asu/volume8/number7/>
- Ostroff, C. and Kozlowski, S.W. (1992). Organizational socialization as a learning process: the role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology*, 45(4), 849-74.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pearce, W.B. & Sharp, S.M. (1973). Self-disclosing communication. *Journal of Communication*, 23, 409-425.
- Perrewé, P. L., Young, A. M., & Blass, F. R. (2002). Mentoring within the political arena. *Human resources management: Perspectives, context, functions, and outcomes*, 4, 343-55.
- Richardson C.A. & Rabiee F. (2001) A question of access: An exploration of the factors influencing the health of young males aged 15-19 living in Corby and their use of health care services. *Health Education Journal*, 60(1), 3-16.
- Rosenfeld, L. B., & Kendrick, L. (1984). Choosing to be open: An empirical investigation of subjective reasons for self-disclosing. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 48, 326-343.
- Ryan, K., & Cooper, J. M. (2007). *Those Who Can, Teach* (11th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- Shea, G. F. (1994), Mentoring: Helping employees reach their full potential. *American Management Association*. New-York.

- Spence, N., Fox, J., Golding, L., & Daiches, A. (2012). Supervisee self-disclosure: A clinical psychology perspective. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 21, 178-192.
- Sprecher, S. (1987). The effects of self-disclosure given and received on affection for an intimate partner and stability of the relationship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 4, 115-127.
- Sprecher, S., Treger, S., & Wondra, J. D. (2012). Effects of self-disclosure role on liking, closeness, and other impressions in get-acquainted interactions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30, 497-514. doi: 10.1177/0265407512459033.
- Sprecher, S., Treger, S., Wondra, J. D., Hilaire, N., & Wallpe, K. (2013). Taking turns: Reciprocal self-disclosure promotes liking in initial interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 860-866.
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- St-Jean, E. (2012). Mentoring as professional development for novice entrepreneurs: maximizing the learning¹. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 16(3), 200-216.
- St-Jean, E., & Mathieu, C. (2011). Optimizing Learning for Novice Entrepreneurs in a mentoring relationship: The Importance of Mentee's Self-disclosure. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 17(2), 11-21.
- Stanulis, R. N., & Floden, R. E. (2009). Intensive mentoring as a way to help beginning teachers develop balanced instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(2), 112-122.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Procedures and techniques for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Stricker, G. (2003). The many faces of self-disclosure. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 59(5), 623-630.
- Tang, S. Y. F., & Choi, P. L. (2005). Connecting theory and practice in mentor preparation: Mentoring for the improvement of teaching and learning. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 13(3), 383-401.
- Thibaut, J. W., and Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Thomas L, MacMillan J, McColl E, Hale C & Bond S (1995) Comparison of focus group and individual interview methodology in examining patient satisfaction with nursing care. *Social Sciences in Health* 1, 206-219.
- Walkington, J. (2005a). Mentoring preservice teachers in the preschool setting: Perceptions of the role. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 30(1), 28-35.
- Walkington, J. (2005). Becoming a teacher: Encouraging development of teacher identity through reflective practice. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(1), 53-64.
- Walsh, B. B., Gillespie, C. K., Greer, J. M., & Eanes, B. E. (2003). Influence of dyadic mutuality on counselor trainee willingness to self-disclose clinical mistakes to supervisors. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 21(2), 83-98.
- Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal and hyper-personal interaction. *Communication Research*, 23(1), 3-43.
- Wanberg, C. R., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. and Marchese, M. (2006). Mentor and protégé predictor and outcomes of mentoring in a formal mentoring program. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(3), 410-23.

- Wanberg, C. R., Welsh, E. T., & Hezlett, S. A. (2003). Mentoring research: A review and dynamic process model. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 22, 39-124.
- Wanberg, C. R., Welsh, E. T. and Kammeyer-Mueller, J. (2007). Protégé and mentor Self-disclosure: levels and outcomes within formal mentoring dyads in a corporate context. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(2), 398-412.
- Wang, J., Strong, M., & Odell, S. (2004). Mentor-novice conversations about teaching: A comparison of two US and two Chinese cases. *The Teachers College Record*, 106(4), 775-813.
- Wang, J., & Odell, S. J. (2007). An alternative conception of mentor-novice relationships: Learning to teach in reform-minded ways as a context. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 23(4), 473-489.
- Webb, A., & Wheeler, S. (1998). How honest to counsellors dare to be in the supervisory relationship?: An exploratory study. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 26(4).
- Wertsch, J.V. (1991) A socio-cultural approach to socially shared cognition. In L. Resnick, J. Levine & S. Teasley. *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp.85-100). Hyattsville, MD: American Psychological Association.
- Westermeyer, J.F. (1998). Predictors and characteristics of mental health among men at midlife: a 32-year longitudinal study. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 68(2), 265-273.
- Wheless, L. R. and Grotz, J. (1977). The measurement of trust and its relationship to Self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research*, 3(3), 250-257.
- Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2002). Teacher preparation research: An insider's view from the outside. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(3), 190-204.

- Wilson, S. M., & Peterson, P. L. (2006). *Theories of learning and teaching: what do they mean for educators?*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Wrench, J. S., & Punyanunt, N. M. (2004). Advisee-advisor communication: An exploratory study examining interpersonal communication variables in the graduate advisee-advisor relationship. *Communication Quarterly*, 52(3), 224-236.
- Yamada, H., & TAM, A. Y. W. (1996). Prediction study of adult creative achievement: Torrance's longitudinal study of creativity revisited. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 30(2), 144-149.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research. Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Young, A. M., & Perrewé, P. L. (2000). The exchange relationship between mentors and protégés: The development of a framework. *Human Resources Management Review*, 10(2), 177-209.
- Zhang, S., Alshukri, A., Alnajjar, K., Zenteno, P., Hsu, C. *Mentors' self-disclosure and preservice teachers' learning to teach*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Khaled Ismail Alnajjar

Department of Teaching & Learning
College of Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

E-mail address: Abedal@unlv.nevada.edu
Handalah2000@hotmail.com

Education:

Master of Arts in Education/Curriculum & Instruction
University of Phoenix, 2009

Bachelor degree in English Literature
Al-Mustansiriya University, 2000

Dissertation Title:

A Multiple Case Study Analysis of Mentor-Mentee Perception of the Effectiveness of Self-Disclosure in the Field Experience

Conference Presentations:

Zhang, S., Alshrukri, A., Zenteno, A. P., Alnajjar, K., & Hsu, C. (2015, April). *Self-disclosure in mentoring preservice teachers in field experiences*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Chicago, Illinois.

Zhang, S., Alshukri, A., Alnajjar, K., Zenteno, P., & Hsu, C. (2015, February). *A study of self-disclosure between mentors and pre-service teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Teacher Educators. Phoenix, AZ.

Dunkerly-Bean, J., Bean, T., & Alnajjar, K. (2013). *Asylum: Exploring the intersection of human rights and cosmopolitan critical literacy through global literature and digital storytelling with adolescents in an international charter school*. Paper presentation at the Literacy Research Association's 62nd Annual Conference, Dallas, TX.

Dunkerly-Bean, J., Bean, T., & Alnajjar, K. (2012). *Adolescent Literacy and the Gendered Self: (Re) Constructing Gender Through Global Multimedia Literacy Practices: the Girl Citizen Reader: Gender and Literacy Education for 21st Century Citizenship*. Alternative Session presentation at the Literacy Research Association's 61st Annual Conference, San Diego, CA

Publications:

Dunkerly-Bean, J., Bean, T., & Alnajjar, K. (2014). Seeking asylum: Adolescents explore the crossroads of human rights education and cosmopolitan critical literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 58(3), 230-241.

Dissertation Examination Committee:

Committee Chair, Shaoan Zhang, Ph.D.
Committee member, Jane McCarthy, Ed.D.
Committee member, Katrina Liu, Ph.D.
Graduate College representative, Vicki J. Rosser, Ph.D.